

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1975

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

"NATION REVIEW" ARTICLE ON
ALLEGATIONS AGAINST DR. M. A. COLSTON

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government and Main Roads) (11.4 a.m.): I would like to draw the attention of the House to an article in the current issue of the newspaper "Nation Review", written by Mr. Robert Cameron in Brisbane, and headed "Field—will he be a Canberra leper? (Possibly)".

In particular, I would like to personally deny one section of the story which refers to myself, and I quote from that article as follows:—

"I understand that the police information on the burnt down school (that smearingly inferred that Colston was an arsonist) came from a member of the Commonwealth Police who is a N.P. (National Party) member and a former State policeman.

"According to A.L.P. M.L.A. Kev. Hooper"—(the honourable member for Archerfield)—"the young Liberal backbencher David Byrne was given the goodies via N.P. Minister Russell Hinze."

Mr. Speaker and honourable members: this is a politically mischievous and personally offensive statement which I completely deny.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Good on you, Russell.

Mr. HINZE: I'll take you apart, brother, before I'm finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HINZE: Honourable members would acknowledge, I am sure, that it has not been my style over many years in Parliament to use this Chamber to attack the character and besmirch the good reputation of a fellow member, or anyone outside the House. I make no attempt to pass judgment on what the honourable member for Belmont saw fit to raise in the Chamber during the debate that led to the appointment of Senator Field. What he raises in this House is his business. It is certainly nothing to do with me, unless it touches on some aspect of my ministerial responsibilities or my role as representative of the South Coast electorate.

It should be remembered that as Minister for Main Roads, far from denigrating Dr. Colston, as this scurrilous article suggests, I tried to assist Dr. Colston when he came to me through the Public Service. In fact, he was seconded to the Main Roads Department, under my control, before he resigned from the Public Service to accept the A.L.P. Senate nomination. Dr. Colston himself would confirm this.

In view of these facts, which are fairly widely known, it was quite a surprise to me that the honourable member for Archerfield should apparently be associated with an article such as this, which can only have the effect of besmirching my reputation as a member of this Parliament and a Minister.

TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1975

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. E. H. Houghton, Redcliffe) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

SOLICITORS' TRUST ACCOUNT DEFICIENCIES; ERROR IN ANSWER TO QUESTION

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.1 a.m.): On Thursday, 11 September, I gave to this House an answer to a question by the honourable member for Lytton relative to solicitors' trust accounts. The information I gave was provided for me by the Assistant Under Secretary (Mr. W. May) to the Department of Justice.

On Friday, 12 September, Mr. May informed me by letter of an error in the information he had provided. He stated that the amounts detailed were obtained by him by telephone from the secretary, Queensland Law Society, but owing to an error in transcription the amount for default by John Desmond Currie was reported to Parliament as \$852,526.75 whereas the correct figure was \$52,526.75.

I have had discussion with Mr. May, who has informed me that he cannot state when or how the error occurred as the notes he made at the time of the telephone conversation between the Queensland Law Society and himself and the draft he gave to his typist were not retained. I have pointed out to Mr. May the extreme seriousness of the error, and have received from him an apology tendered to all honourable members and to any other persons who may have been caused any embarrassment.

I personally regret the incident occasioned by the circumstances I have outlined.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I rise to a point of order. I do not know anything about the article to which the Minister has referred. I make it quite clear that I certainly never allowed my name to be associated with it.

Mr. HINZE: I would like the honourable member for Archerfield to either confirm or deny in this House that he gave the information referred to in this article to the author, Mr. Cameron.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to accept the denial of the honourable member for Archerfield.

Mr. HINZE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Justices Act 1886–1975.

Orders in Council under—

Harbours Act 1955–1972.

Forestry Act 1959–1975.

Forestry Act 1959–1975 and the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975.

Medical Act 1939–1973.

Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958–1971.

Regulations under—

Liquor Act 1912–1973.

Health Act 1937–1974.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. SITE FOR HIGH SCHOOL, CREEK ROAD, CARINA

Mr. Byrne, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

(1) Does his department hold land on the corner of Fursden and Creek Roads, Carina? If so, what is its area and has it been designated for a specific purpose?

(2) If it has not been designated for a specific purpose, will he set the area aside for a State high school, because its situation is ideally suited to accommodate both the developing area of Creek Road and the already developed areas?

Answers:—

(1) The Land Administration Commission is presently awaiting a claim from the owners of this land for compensation for the acquisition of this site by my department. The total area of the land is given as 36 acres 0 roods 31 perches (approximately 14.6 hectares).

(2) The site is being acquired against the possible future need for a high school.

2. ROAD WORKS, CREEK ROAD, CARINA

Mr. Byrne, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) Is he aware that in the construction of the new road-works in Creek Road, Carina, by the Brisbane City Council, virtually no thought was given to the access and safety of home-dwellers and institutions that existed along the road prior to the new construction?

(2) Will he investigate the situation in order to alleviate the inconvenience and difficulties, in relation to safety and reasonable access, caused not only to home-dwellers but more specifically to the Belmont Private Hospital, the Salvin Park Nursing Home and St. Paul's Primary School?

Answers:—

(1) No.

(2) If the question relates to limited access across the median strip in the road, I would suggest that this limitation applies on many major roads. If, however, the question relates to other aspects of inconvenience or difficulty of which I am not presently aware, I would be pleased to take up the matter with the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor on receipt of further information.

3. BAN ON VEGETABLE PROCESSING IN QUEENSLAND

Mr. Gunn, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Is he aware of the ban by the Combined Metal Industries Union on vegetable processors in Queensland and that, if the ban is not lifted, millions of dollars worth of vegetables will rot in the fields in the Lockyer Valley alone?

(2) Will he urge the union to lift the ban to enable the processors to harvest crops, which mean \$20,000,000 to vegetable growers in Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) Yes. I am informed that the Combined Metal Industries Union has placed an overtime ban, and a ban on the employment of additional labour, at vegetable processing plants. Peas and baby carrots are now being processed, and bean processing will commence in October. Processors need to process seven days a week. Because harvesting is impossible during wet weather, lost production must be made up by working shifts on weekends. Failure to do this will obviously result in a substantial proportion of the crops not being harvested.

(2) Negotiations are currently taking place between the processors and the union, and I sincerely hope that their differences can be quickly resolved.

4. TEENAGE SEX EDUCATION

Mr. Alison, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Is he aware that the Commonwealth Minister for Health opened the first teenage sex clinic in Queensland in Humanist House, Brisbane, on 5 September and that the clinic will be run by the atheist body, the Humanist Society?

(2) Will the society be able to peddle the type of advice on homosexuality, use of contraceptives, etc., to our teenagers and pre-teenagers required by the socialist A.L.P. Government in its efforts to have parents' responsibilities taken over by "Big Brother" in Canberra?

(3) In an effort to counter this serious challenge to parents' rights and responsibilities, will he consider increasing his department's sponsorship activities of teenage sex education through the appropriate organisations, which will assist parents in these very serious responsibilities?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) I regret that the honourable member's information regarding the opening of the clinic and his assumption as to the manner in which it will be conducted is totally correct. I share his concern that the Commonwealth Government's attitude of exposing young people to sexual freedoms in this way will lead to the breakdown of family relations between parents and their children. I deplore the Federal Government's determination to wreck not only the economic wealth of our nation but also its moral standards. Its persistence along these lines is leading to decadence.

(3) The Queensland Health Education Council is the community's proper resource centre for sex education information. The council has an extensive film library of sex education films for all ages—children to adults. Printed information is also available, as well as the services of lecturers who have an acceptable attitude towards such subjects. I welcome the honourable member's suggestion that activities of the council in these matters should be increased through appropriate organisations.

5. TELEPHONE SERVICE, BAMAGA ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY

Mr. Deeral, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries—

Will he make representations to the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the Bamaga community to upgrade the present telephone service in the area?

Answer:—

Representations have been made to Telecom seeking a rural automatic exchange at Bamaga. This will provide a 24-hour telephone service with direct trunk-line dialling. Telecom is undertaking an examination of the proposal and has indicated a willingness to provide the facility if such is economically viable. The honourable member is assured that representations will continue to be made until this desirable facility is installed.

6. POLICE HOUSING IN COUNTRY AREAS

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Police—

(1) Is he aware of complaints made about the provision of housing for police in country areas?

(2) What allowance is given for rent where official accommodation is not available?

(3) Does his department have any plans to lift the allowance in the near future?

Answers:—

(1) Housing difficulties for police personnel in some country areas are fully appreciated and all possible assistance is rendered within existing available resources.

(2) The Police Award—State provides for payment of rent allowance of 30 cents per day for married officers, 20 cents per day for single officers, and 30 cents per day for female officers, not provided with departmental accommodation. The Police Officers Award—State provides for payment of \$7.70 per fortnight to commissioned officers in similar circumstances.

(3) Rent allowance is a matter for determination by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

7. MARINE DEPARTMENT FILING SYSTEM

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services—

(1) Has the Brisbane City Council been forced to make its own investigation of the upper reaches of Breakfast Creek because Marine Department files are out of date?

(2) Does he plan any updating of departmental filing procedures?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) Investigations carried out by the Brisbane City Council in the upper reaches of Breakfast Creek relate to its proposed flood mitigation scheme. This is a matter concerning drainage and, as

such, comes under the jurisdiction of that council. My Department of Harbours and Marine is concerned only with matters relating to navigation in such tributaries and any investigations carried out by my department for this purpose are fully and properly recorded on department files.

8. FOOTBALL POOLS

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Does he propose to allow football pools to operate in Queensland?

(2) Are they illegal at the present time and, if so, under what legislation are they regulated?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) There is no provision in any legislation administered by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General for the issue of permits of this nature.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

RAILWAY LINE TO REDCLIFFE THROUGH KALLANGUR

Mr. AKERS: I ask the Minister for Transport: As Redcliffe will win the Brisbane Rugby League premiership next Sunday, can he advise the House if Redcliffe will be rewarded by the construction of a railway line to that area through Kallangur?

Mr. K. W. HOOPER: Mr. Speaker, no doubt you, the honourable member for Murumba and the honourable member for Pine Rivers are vitally interested in this question. The Rail to Redcliffe Committee waited on me on a couple of occasions, and I forwarded its representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport. At present an investigation is being undertaken by my department in that regard.

As to a reward to the team—I am afraid I could not comment on that suggestion, other than to say that we hope that the Commonwealth Government will take another look at what it has already done in preventing our receiving finance as from the end of this financial year. If it does, we will most certainly be looking at the matter again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be quite happy if I were as sure of our getting the railway line as I am of our winning the premiership.

CONDUCT OF MEMBERS OF A.L.P. TOWARDS SENATOR FIELD

Mr. AIKENS: I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to Press and other reports of churlish conduct coupled with cheap abuse of Senator Field by A.L.P. members and supporters in a Brisbane hotel? If so, and in view of the actions of and cesspit-type language used by A.L.P. senators in Canberra to Senator Field, will he have all records and publications of and by this Parliament altered to define that the initials "A.L.P." stand for "Australian Louts Party"?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I have read the Press reports referred to by the honourable member, who has a great wealth of experience in the political arena and the ability to use very descriptive terms. I have no doubt that his opinion of the A.L.P. is shared by many other people of Australia. His remarks are fairly well on the ball.

As for the A.L.P. and what it stands for today—it certainly is not the party it was many years ago under former Labor Premiers and Prime Ministers. It is now an entirely different organisation, a socialistic one bent towards Communism. That is what the A.L.P. stands for today. It is known as an incompetent party.

STATEMENT BY LEADER OF OPPOSITION ON HOUSING

Mr. JENSEN: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Why, in answer to a question asked on 11 September concerning a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to obtaining more finance from the Federal Government for housing in Queensland, did the Minister rant and rave when, in answer to a question I asked him on 3 September, he suggested that I exert my undoubted influence on my political friends and comrades in Canberra in the interests of the State? Are we to deduce from his ravings that he is not interested in co-operation from the Opposition in assisting to obtain extra finance for Queensland?

Mr. LEE: Obviously the honourable member's influence in the A.L.P. leaves a lot to be desired. In fact it appears to be a very weak influence indeed, because he asked me his question approximately a week prior to the publication of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. Why shouldn't I be utterly disgusted at the efforts of the member for Bundaberg and the Leader of the Opposition? After all, as I have said on another occasion, the Federal Government's allocation to Queensland for housing has been cut by 30 per cent from \$43,000,000 to \$31,000,000, and if we add to this the inflation rate of 25 per cent we see that in real money terms the State's allocation has been reduced by 55 per cent. Why wouldn't I rant and rave?

Why shouldn't the people of Queensland be utterly disappointed at the fact that Queensland was the only State whose allocation was reduced by such a high percentage? Why shouldn't the people whom the A.L.P. is supposed to represent—the workers, the people who want low-cost housing—be alarmed? It is apparent that the A.L.P. has no concern whatsoever for them. In those circumstances, why shouldn't members on the Government side ask questions so that the matter can be brought into the open? The honourable member should be utterly ashamed to ask such a question.

INTRODUCTION OF BANKCARDS

Mr. GOLEBY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Will the introduction of Bankcards seriously affect State revenue? If so, what action does he propose taking to offset any shortfall? Will he advise the public of any misgivings he has, or any shortcomings that he sees, in the proposed new banking system?

Sir GORDON CHALK: The introduction of Bankcards to Queensland causes me considerable concern. It is a fact that Bankcards are in use in two southern States. When representatives of the Bankcard Control Association approached me about two months ago on the introduction of Bankcards in this State, I pointed out to them something of which they were not aware, namely, that section 42A of our Stamp Act lays down specifically that duty will be payable on transactions of this nature.

Those honourable members who were in this Chamber four, five or six years ago will recall that a body or firm was established by certain businessmen, which was to undertake the collection of all accounts from various firms in the city and then institute a system of bulk payment. In the light of that intention we amended the Act and wrote in section 42A. When I drew the attention of the representatives of the Bankcard Control Association to that, they realised that the introduction of Bankcards to this State could be challenged. I understand that they took certain legal advice and then sought to come back to me for a further discussion. As recently as late August and early September discussions were going on concerning the legality of the Bankcard system without an amendment to the Act or an indication by the Government that it was prepared to outline some basis on which the system could operate.

I am perturbed in that whilst all these discussions were going on—and as late as last week I exchanged telegrams with the association—the association proceeded to insert very large advertisements in our city newspapers

(in some instances involving up to two pages), indicating to the public that under the Bankcard system certain goods can be purchased and so on. I am also concerned in that letters are being distributed by the various banks—in fact, I received one from a bank indicating the amount of \$1,000 that I can have under the Bankcard system, without having any financial involvement. Because my wife has two small accounts (one in a savings bank, and one with a private bank), she received letters indicating that Bankcards will be available to her, without any indication of the banking of funds. Whilst I know that this system has operated in other places, it is still being discussed with the association. I have drawn the attention of its representatives to the fact that until such time as agreement is reached I regard the proposal as illegal.

The other point raised by the honourable member related to the effect of Bankcards on cheque stamp duty. The answer given by the association is that Bankcards will be used principally for transactions that would otherwise be in cash and that, therefore, it would not lead to the elimination of a great many cheques. On the other hand, the association says that in some cases it will create a need for the drawing of additional cheques. My belief is that Bankcards will considerably affect the State's revenue from stamp duty.

The position is presently being examined. I have not yet indicated that the system may operate. That will remain the position until I receive further legal advice on the matter.

COMMONWEALTH ABANDONMENT OF R.E.D. SCHEME AID TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Mr. CORY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Has he seen the report in "The Courier-Mail" of Thursday, 11 September, indicating that the Commonwealth Government has abandoned the provision of \$13,000,000 formerly approved under the R.E.D. Scheme? Was that the money taken into account in the recent formula for the distribution of the \$5,000,000 by the State Government to local authorities to help alleviate unemployment? If so, does he realise that, because of the R.E.D. moneys expected by some councils, they received no help from the State distribution? As it now appears that these moneys will not be forthcoming under the R.E.D. Scheme, will he consider giving those councils a share of the distribution?

Sir GORDON CHALK: In the distribution of funds that were to be made available to this State under the R.E.D. Scheme, at approximately \$5,000,000 a time, we took into consideration the total amount allocated by the Commonwealth. Our reason for doing that was that in some areas very large sums

of money had been allocated by the Commonwealth Government under the R.E.D. scheme without any regard whatsoever to the priority of requirements of the area or the number of unemployed in the locality. Consequently, when it was announced that this money would be available to those areas, other shires to which no allocation had been made approached the State and sought assistance out of the \$5,000,000 that was provided by the Commonwealth and which it was laid down would be distributed only on the basis of an area's unemployed. Consequently, we arranged for the relevant Commonwealth department to provide us with details of unemployment in each shire. To that figure we added the amount of money known to be allocated by the Commonwealth or in regard to which advice had been given to various local authorities. By adding that to the \$5,000,000, we arrived at a figure per head of unemployed. Having arrived at that, we allocated to each local authority a particular amount; but any local authority that had received or was due to receive more than that from the Commonwealth did not receive any additional funds from the State's allocation. There was no attempt to take back from them that which the R.E.D. scheme had provided. This left additional funds to be divided among those who had not received allocation. Consequently a distribution was made and no shire was disadvantaged. In fact, those shires that had not received anything received at least a portion of the money that was available to us. That has worked.

Unfortunately because of the Commonwealth Government's decision to discontinue the R.E.D. scheme—not the action of the State but the action of the Commonwealth Government—local authorities cannot proceed with a particular project unless it has already been commenced. In addition, in relation to projects which are being undertaken in stages (such as stage 1 or phase 1, with stage 2 or phase 2 being a necessary aspect of the over-all scheme) only the stage or phase that has already been approved and is under way can be proceeded with. Consequently many shires that had been promised money under the R.E.D. scheme set about preparing plans and specifications and are ready to proceed but are now told that they cannot proceed with that work at present.

I believe that this House is aware that, under the R.E.D. scheme Queensland was due for \$32,000,000 of the funds that were to be made available. The Federal Budget provided \$9,000,000 to cover expenditure already incurred and an additional \$13,000,000 for expenditure this year. Nine and 13 are 22. What happened to the other \$10,000,000, no-one knows. The point is that that is the very work that is now being cancelled to get the Commonwealth off the hook in this direction.

All I can say to the honourable member for Warwick is that this State has played the game fairly and has distributed its funds in accordance with its obligations. It has honoured its agreement; the Commonwealth has not. As the Commonwealth has not honoured its agreement, I cannot do anything to assist the local authorities who have been caught in this web; I have no additional funds available for distribution to them.

EXPORT OF AUSTRALIAN CATTLE DOGS

Mr. FRAWLEY: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Is he aware of a current rumour that the Federal Government is contemplating a ban on the export of Australian cattle dogs? Could he give an assurance that breeders in Queensland will be given every assistance to export these dogs so that cattlemen in overseas countries can continue to obtain the services of the best working dog in the world?

Mr. SULLIVAN: Could I inquire of the questioner whether he referred to a ban on the export of cattle or cattle dogs?

Mr. Frawley: Australian cattle dogs.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I have not heard about such a ban. I have often talked with the honourable member for Murrumba about the qualities of cattle dogs and I think that most honourable members know the value of the good old blue heeler. I recently visited countries in South-East Asia and the Middle East where Governments are embarking upon a policy of developing their primary industries, including the cattle industry. I pointed out to members of those Governments that they would need structural equipment—yards, branding cradles and this type of thing—to handle the cattle and I think that if they are going to build up a cattle industry there could be quite a market for blue cattle dogs. I will look into the matter.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS, ALBION FIVEWAYS

Dr. CRAWFORD: I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Does he recall my inquiry some months ago regarding the necessity for traffic lights at the Albion Fiveways? As his answer then was that there was no evidence that the Brisbane City Council had even listed that dangerous intersection for the provision of traffic lights, and as traffic hazards in the area will increase when the T.A.B. building is completed, could he now say what action his department will take to have life-saving traffic lights installed at that intersection?

Mr. HINZE: I recall the question asked by the honourable member for Wavell. The representations made by him in respect of that dangerous area were conveyed to our friends in Canberra through the Meters programme. I have not been successful in

convincing Mr. Jones that we need funds to install traffic lights at that site. However, further representations will be made.

MINERAL LEASES, BRACEWELL AREA

Mr. HARTWIG: In asking the Minister for Mines and Energy a question without notice, I draw his attention to an article in "The Courier-Mail" last Friday, 12 September, which reported a statement attributed to the Commonwealth Minister for Health, Dr. Everingham, to the effect that the Queensland Government was planning a rip-off of farmers in the Bracewell area who are farming mineral leases. In view of the Commonwealth Government's policies, could he inform the House of the true situation at Bracewell, and what arrangements he is making to meet the people in that region?

Mr. CAMM: I have read the article containing the statements attributed to Dr. Everingham. If he was correctly reported, his statements are a further example of the two-faced policy of the Federal Government. On the one hand the Government to which he belongs has ripped off from people in the rural sector a total of \$27,000,000 by way of the cancellation of dairy subsidies and \$4,500,000 to \$5,000,000 by way of the elimination of the free-milk scheme to school-children. As well it has removed the subsidy paid on superphosphate. I could go on and on illustrating the vast sums of money that the Federal Government has ripped off the primary industries of Queensland. On the other hand, Dr. Everingham, who has denigrated the sugar industry and, if he had his way, would kill our tobacco industry, puts himself forward as the champion of the dairy farmers in the area referred to by the honourable member for Callide.

It is true that a mining company and the cement works have applied for mining leases covering much of the area, which is a mineral field. The land titles given to local farmers are mining homestead leases.

The Mines Department has called for an environmental impact study to be carried out and for the report on that study to be presented to it so that it can make an assessment of the position after the case has been heard in the Mining Wardens Court and his recommendation has been submitted to me. At the request of the member representing the area and of the member for Callide, I will be visiting the area on Thursday of this week in conjunction with officers of my department, namely, the Assistant Under Secretary and the Mines Inspector, to carry out a personal inspection so that we can make our own assessment of the situation. I am prepared to meet the local residents at a public meeting on Thursday afternoon.

FULL COURT DECISION ON BREATHALYSER EVIDENCE

Mr. JONES: I ask the Minister for Transport: Following the judgment delivered last Friday by the Full Court in relation to the lack of evidence of qualifications of police officers to operate breathalysers, has doubt been cast on the convictions of more than 2,000 drink-drivers between 1 September 1974 and 12 May 1975? If so, what action will be taken to ensure that motorists who were wrongfully convicted will receive redress and the benefit of the law?

Mr. K. W. HOOPER: The matter is presently under investigation.

Sir Gordon Chalk: Read this morning's paper.

Mr. K. W. HOOPER: As the Deputy Premier indicates, the honourable member would have found his answer if he had read this morning's paper.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961-1974 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Factories and Shops Act 1960-1973 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

DISEASES IN TIMBER BILL

INITIATION

Hon. K. B. TOMKINS (Roma—Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to provide for the taking of measures for the extermination or the prevention or control of the dissemination of any disease in timber and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND
ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (12.5 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961-1974 in certain particulars.”

Several Acts on the Statute Book of this State are regarded as legislation of major importance, and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act is in this category. Consequently, any Bill which will amend in a substantial manner important provisions of a major statute is one that merits the close consideration and attention of this House. Such a Bill it is my ministerial responsibility now to introduce.

I cannot do better in opening than quote from the policy speech of the leader of my party delivered on 14 November 1974 at Brisbane before the last State election. Sir Gordon said—

“My Government has a good labour relations record and now proposes a new system of secret ballots which will enable employees where a strike has been called to determine for themselves whether the strike will continue. It is obvious that the present penal provisions against workers who engage in strikes are not appropriate in this day and age and my Government proposes to repeal these penal provisions.”

Some of the provisions of the Bill will honour the promises contained in the extract quoted from the Government’s policy speech.

The principal Act is concerned mainly with regulating the employer-employee relationship and consequently, according to which elements of the productive process they are involved with, some measures will be approved of by trade unions, disapproved by employer organisations, and vice versa. I therefore propose to give an outline of the Bill.

As promised by the Government, the present penal provisions which operate against employees who engage in strikes will be repealed. I refer particularly to the existing provisions in sections 98 and 99, which have not operated effectively in recent years. The present section 98, *inter alia*, declares a strike to be unlawful unless authorised by a secret ballot taken before the strike occurs. In recent years sudden stoppages have become widespread, but proceedings for a breach of section 98 (that is, the invoking of penal provisions against the strikers) have not been instituted by an industrial union of employers or by the

individual employers affected. On the one hand there has been the unwillingness on the part of employers to prosecute and on the other hand there has been an A.C.T.U. policy operative throughout Australia to ignore penal sanctions imposed in such circumstances. Consequently, the existing section 98 has outlived its usefulness. It will be repealed and replaced by a new section 98, which will be devoid of the present penal provisions but will enable ballots on continuation of strikes to be held after a strike has occurred.

Generally these secret ballots are not intended to replace the present conciliatory processes which are used by the Industrial Commission to settle industrial disputes: rather they will be an additional tool to assist in resolving work stoppages of longer duration.

Where a strike that involves a cessation of work occurs, the commission may of its own motion, and shall upon application of an industrial union of employees or not less than 20 per cent of the employees engaged in the place where the strike has occurred, direct the registrar or an industrial magistrate to conduct a secret ballot where the strike has occurred. This ballot, at the commission’s discretion, can be of all those employees at the place where the strike has occurred or can be confined either to those employees who are on strike or to those members of industrial unions who are on strike. If directed by the commission, separate ballots can be held in respect of each union that has members on strike. If a majority is not in favour of the continuation of the strike, then the registrar or industrial magistrate is required to publish the result of the ballot in an advertisement in a newspaper circulating in the locality where the strike has occurred, and any employee who without reasonable cause (proof of which lies on him) does not return to work within seven days of the publication of the advertisement is deemed to have terminated on and from that date the employment in which he was engaged at the date on which the strike occurred. Disagreement with the result of the strike ballot is excluded as reasonable cause.

The new section 99 will ensure that there is no interference with the conduct of a strike ballot ordered by the Industrial Commission. Picketing in the vicinity of the place where the secret ballot is being conducted will not be allowed. There will be a prohibition of intimidation or threats to or obstruction of any employee on strike proceeding to cast his vote in the ballot. Attempts to intimidate, threaten or obstruct will likewise not be permitted and power will be conferred on all members of the Police Force to arrest without warrant any person committing certain offences with respect to the secret ballots. There are recent examples of action which it is hoped to restrain. Similar forms of conduct will

not be permitted in respect of secret ballots because, to the extent that section 534 of the Criminal Code is inconsistent with section 99 of the Act, section 99 will prevail and the provisions of section 534 of the Criminal Code shall to the extent of the inconsistency be of no force and effect.

Similarly it is proposed to correct a defect in section 48 dealing with resignation from a union. The section permits resignations to be made but does not prescribe the method of resignation. Frequently in proceedings for recovery of union dues it is denied by the union that a resignation has been received from the member being prosecuted. Accordingly it will be prescribed that a notice of resignation must be in writing and shall be duly given if it is left at the registered office of the union or sent by post to the registered office of the industrial union.

It has been established, as a result of disciplinary action taken by a certain union against several of its members who had refused to take part in a strike called by the union in respect of a completely non-industrial issue, that the only method whereby these members could take legal action to preserve their union membership would be through an expensive Supreme Court action. It is therefore proposed to confer on the Industrial Court the power to declare whether a person is entitled to admission to an industrial union and to direct if necessary that he or she be admitted and also power to declare whether a person is or is not a member of an industrial union.

Dealing further with the activities of union officials—briefly an authorised officer of a union has the right of entry into any place where a person carries on a calling in respect of which that union is registered. The right of entry is at any time during which the calling is carried on but the union official can only conduct interviews during lunch hour or non-working time.

Instances have come to hand where officials have exceeded the power of entry conferred on them by section 136 of the Act. The instances that have occurred were that some union officials possibly unintentionally did not advise the employer or his representative of their presence and were found intruding at large to the detriment of the productive processes being carried on. It is therefore proposed to place a legal obligation upon a union official exercising his right of entry to immediately report his presence to the employer or his delegate. Failure to do so will render the union official a trespasser. However, such a provision, it is felt, could impose hardship on some union officials, particularly those working in the more remote areas of the State, and in these circumstances or where upon entry the union official discovers that the employer is absent and has not appointed a delegate to act in his stead the union

official does not become a trespasser. Naturally the quid pro quo in this provision will be that it should make employers more conscious of their responsibility to leave some person in charge when they are absent.

Honourable members will also be aware that the principal Act also has secret-ballot provisions in relation to the election of union officials. Briefly, the existing provisions enable a union or branch of a union, or a proportion of the union membership, to request the Industrial Registrar to conduct an election of union officials. However, under these provisions the registrar is required to adopt a passive role in that he must await a request. The proposed new section 86A enables the registrar, upon being satisfied on reasonable grounds, to act on his own volition to conduct the election. It also provides an avenue of redress for any union member who has information or evidence which can satisfy the registrar that an irregularity in the conduct of the ballot is likely to occur if controlled by union officials.

The Queensland Government in this Bill will be giving a lead to the rest of Australia in liberalising long service leave. Upon the proclamation of the amending Act, the period of long-service leave which is granted under the principal Act will be exclusive of public holidays, whereas previously long service leave was inclusive of any public holidays that occurred during that leave.

The Queensland Government some time ago agreed to the I.L.O. convention on equal remuneration and, as a consequence, the provisions of section 12 of the Act are being expanded with respect to equal remuneration for the sexes. In addition to the requirement for the same wage to be paid to persons of either sex performing the same work or producing the same return of profit to the employer, the words "or performing work of a like nature or of equal value" will be included.

Again, the passing of the Bill will enable Queensland to agree to the ratification of another I.L.O. convention—protection of workers' representatives. We have in the principal Act, section 101, protection *inter alia* to officers of unions, but to date similar protection has not been conferred upon a safety representative elected by workers under section 59 of the Construction Safety Act. The Bill will confer this protection on these safety representatives.

We are also extending in the Bill the time during which action can be taken to recover arrears of wages due to an employee. Whereas previously, if a case were proved to the satisfaction of an industrial magistrate, the employee had a right to only six months' arrears, with a further six months to be awarded solely at the discretion of the magistrate, it is proposed to grant an employee an absolute right to 12 months' arrears.

It is also proposed to correct a present weakness whereby an unregistered union of employees has access to the commission for the purpose of award making and variation thereof. This will involve amendments to sections 11 and 29.

One of the major principles in the Bill, which involves amendment to several sections, is the substantial rewriting of the provisions relating to industrial agreements. Briefly, the existing situation is that any matter included in an industrial agreement comes within the definition of "industrial matter", and the registrar is obliged to accept any industrial agreement that is filed with him. That industrial agreement is then enforceable as an award of the Commission.

Many "sweetheart" agreements have been made under the existing provisions and these agreements have created discontent and industrial disharmony when employees who are performing similar work but are not covered by the agreement see other employees enjoying the superior benefits that are included in the "sweetheart" agreement.

The effects of the amendments to the various sections will be to create a new set of rules for industrial agreements. Agreements will have to be with respect to industrial matters only and no longer will any matter whatsoever included in an industrial agreement be per se an industrial matter. The agreements will have to be between an industrial union of employees on the one hand and an employer, employers, or union of employers on the other. The agreement will have to be in writing and filed with the registrar, who is then required to refer to the commission every agreement so filed. It is then optional for the commission as to whether it will approve the agreement without a hearing.

Upon approval by the commission the agreement becomes a registered industrial agreement. However, wide powers of intervention and review of industrial agreements will be conferred to eliminate the more unsavoury aspects of the "sweetheart" agreements and the wage leap-frogging that they can help to induce. It is not proposed, however, to interfere with private contracts of service made between an employer and individual employee in an award-free area. In addition it is proposed to confer upon the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission the power to make a general ruling exempting an agreement or class of agreement from the new provisions. This discretion is conferred because, for example, some types of agreements with respect to industrial matters are merely exchanges of correspondence between an employer and a union on a provision contained in an award.

This Bill contains more major amendments to the principal Act than any other amending Bill since the Act was first introduced in 1961. Consequently, all the monetary

penalties and other money references that are in the Act have also been reviewed at this time. Generally, all monetary penalties in the Act have been doubled in accordance with commensurate movements in the Consumer Price Index since 1961 and, where necessary, appropriate adjustments have been made to other monetary references. All these amendments have been itemised in the Schedule to the Bill.

There are also a number of other minor procedural amendments included in the Bill, to which specific reference need not be made at this stage.

I commend this important piece of legislation to the Committee.

Mr. YEWDALE (Rockhampton North) (12.23 p.m.): As spokesman for the Opposition on legislation such as is now before the Committee, I take it from the Minister's opening remarks that he was suggesting that the Government enjoys good labour relations. Even if the Government considers that the provisions of this Bill will do anything to improve its rather shaky labour relations, I do not know what will happen when it tries to impose on the unions generally in this State some of its provisions. There was a weakness in the Minister's approach in that he said that this legislation will probably be received with disapproval by both employers and employees. The Minister may have been referring to the fact that there has been some movement on long service leave and equal remuneration for female workers. I think it would be fair to say that the employers would probably disapprove of a number of provisions in addition to those the Minister hinted at.

The history of this legislation can be seen in Press reports and comments over many years. For the information of the Committee, I will refer only briefly to it. In "The Sunday Mail" of August 1957 we saw the headline, "Hurry up Court Ballots Bill for new Parliament." Then in January 1958, over an article by the political reporter of "The Courier-Mail", there was a headline in large type, "Court Will Run Unions Ballots Soon." The article continued—

"The State Government will legislate in March for the introduction of court-controlled secret ballots."

That article further pointed out that a committee had been advised by industrial experts at that time that this legislation was to be introduced.

The Minister indicated that section 98 has not operated effectively, and that, consequently, it is to be replaced by another section. I do not think the section has operated at all. To be honest, the Minister should have said that, rather than that it has not operated effectively.

The Bill provides that application can be made to the registrar or an industrial magistrate for a strike ballot.

Mr. Jones: After the strike commences.

Mr. YEWDALE: That is right, after the strike commences. It refers to all employees at the place where the strike has occurred. To my mind that does not explain it as it should be explained. When a strike occurs at any given point, are we going to say that all the employees in that area, including those not working at the actual place of dispute, are to be asked to exercise their prerogative of voting on whether the strike should continue or not? Some years ago a dispute arose at the Calcap Power House. It was decided that a strike ballot would be held within a 12-mile radius of the power-house. That is how ridiculous it can be! Some members of the F.E.D. & F.A. were employed at the Calcap Power House and others were employed within a 12-mile radius of the powerhouse on road works etc. When those working outside the power-house were approached by responsible union officials, they said, "We don't give a damn about what is happening at the Calcap Power House. We are not employed there and it doesn't concern us. We are not interested in exercising our franchise in a strike ballot." Rightly so, and I do not think anyone would disagree.

The Minister referred to all employees at the place where a strike occurred. From that it would seem to follow that, if a section of tradesmen in a factory—boiler-makers, for example—decided to take strike action, each and every employee, whether a clerk or, as someone said earlier, a billy-boy, would be approached and asked if he would like to exercise his right to vote on whether those involved in the dispute should continue their strike.

Mr. Moore: That is not the intention.

Mr. YEWDALE: It is not clear. I am sure that workers who learn of this move by the Government would be interested in having that clarified. The provision in the 1958 legislation was introduced with all good intentions by the then Minister, but it was misinterpreted by those responsible for implementing it. It is important that that provision be looked at closely.

The Minister said that, if a ballot is in favour of a return to work, seven days' notice has to be given in a newspaper circulating in the area or district. I am not sure of the word that he used. These days people travel long distances to work. That leaves open to some argument the merit of referring to a newspaper circulating in the area in which the people concerned are working. It seems to me that that provision could open the way to a form of blackmail. Workers engaged in an industry would have worked in that area for varying lengths of time.

As we know, Mr. Hewitt, a worker's long service leave entitlement begins to accrue when his employment commences, and he receives the benefit of that entitlement after the expiration of a certain period. So it seems to me that a worker who will have the right at a secret ballot to decide whether or not to resume work will be blackmailed into deciding to return to work because he knows that if he does not do so he may forfeit his entitlement to long service leave. Workers will be called upon to weigh their long service and other entitlements against any benefit that might be derived from remaining on strike. Furthermore, a worker who is not conversant with the requirement to report for duty within seven days and consequently does not report for work will stand to lose his entitlements. This provision will lead to divisions among workers. It will lead also to more industrial unrest than exists at the present time. It certainly will not create better employer-employee relations in industry.

The Minister spoke of protecting workers who exercise their right to vote in a ballot. He also referred to the possibility of some workers intimidating others who intend to exercise their right to vote. I would not be so naive as to suggest that certain workers do not react to intimidatory tactics of others, but I do not regard the Minister's proposal as being one that will smooth troubled waters. Workers will continue to argue with one another and act in certain ways towards one another. That is a fact of life.

Reference has been made to taking disciplinary action against persons who intimidate workers. I suggest this matter is nothing more than a storm in a teacup. I see no need for the inclusion of a provision allowing disciplinary action to be taken in those circumstances. A worker who is physically assaulted by another has redress at law; he can charge his assailant with assault, so I see no need for the inclusion of such a provision in this measure.

The Minister referred to the right of a union official to enter a job site. I have a trade union background and have had experience of union officials entering job sites. As I understand the Minister, he said that trade union officials are allowed to enter job sites during lunch breaks to discuss with their delegates and members any matters relating to their employment. They are permitted to hold such discussions even if there is no likelihood of an industrial dispute. This happens quite frequently. I suggest, however, that if the union official's right of entry is restricted to the lunch break there will be many instances in which employers will be screaming for union officials not during the lunch break but at 9 o'clock in the morning or at 2 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I can visualise certain circumstances in which the employer will consider that a dispute is likely to occur

on his site and will want a union official on the job immediately. Generally speaking, trade union officials are given a fairly free hand by the employers, but there are some employers who are stupid enough to exclude union officials from their premises during working hours. A union official often helps an employer to iron out problems which, but for the intervention of that union official, could lead to disputation.

The Minister, in referring to secret ballots for the election of union officials, said that a certain number of union members can object to the conduct of such a ballot by a union. This provision has applied for many years. The Minister said that objections will be determined on the substance of the evidence brought forward. I am very interested in who is to determine the substance of the evidence. Will it be the Industrial Registrar who has to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to have a ballot inquired into or declared null and void and that a new ballot should be held?

Mr. Wright: It will be Charlie Porter.

Mr. YEWDAL: I sincerely hope not.

Over the years history has not shown that ballots are run irregularly by the unions.

Mr. Frawley: Oh, rubbish!

Mr. YEWDAL: If the honourable member thinks that it is rubbish, I ask him to give me concrete details. Neither he nor any other honourable member has any real details, although perhaps some honourable members could refer to one or two cases. In fact, in a moment I shall cite two—I am quite prepared to do that—but in general there is consistent regularity. I worked in an industry that has a much tighter system of ballots for selection of officials than that of any State or Federal electoral officer. The Waterside Workers' Union ballot is run very strictly. I can outline the procedures adopted and speak with certainty. As a union official, I was involved very closely in these ballots. It is not the only union I can cite but, from experience, I use it with a great deal of certainty. Ballot irregularities are just not on. Union members are given the right to exercise their prerogative in voting for candidates. Nominations are called in accordance with the rules, and the rules are laid down by the powers that be. The court itself insists that the rules be complied with. If the court insists on them and they are adhered to, what is there to complain about?

While we are talking about numbers, I could well refer to the Premier, who is not in the Chamber at the moment. We all know of the numbers game. In fact, life is a numbers game. The numbers game is worked in selections, preselections, endorsements, union ballots—anything at all. It is a perfectly legitimate manoeuvre.

Mr. Lamont: That is a shockingly cynical outlook.

Mr. YEWDAL: The honourable member got his numbers when he was endorsed—how good, or how close, I do not know.

An Opposition Member: He had someone helping him.

Mr. YEWDAL: Perhaps he needed help.

When a union member exercises his rights through the ballot-paper, elections are usually clear and above board. I shall wait until a later stage of the Bill to refer to the examples I promised to cite. In talking about ballots the Minister did not say anything about interfering in the affairs of the various community organisations and groups or requiring them to have court-controlled ballots.

Mr. Wright: Like the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. YEWDAL: That is one example. There are many boards in the community.

Mr. Doumany: They do not go on strike.

Mr. YEWDAL: We are not talking about strikes in this context; we are talking about a ballot to elect people to certain positions.

There are many employer organisations, company boards, major sporting groups, like the Q.T.C., and so on. I am not fingering anybody. These bodies conduct their own affairs, call for nominations and elect their own representatives. The Minister does not suggest that we should interfere with them. Many of them handle untold thousands of dollars.

I will digress slightly by referring to the amendment covering the long service leave provisions. It would seem to me that that is a step in the right direction, because the proposal relating to statutory holidays will be of benefit to the workers in the community. But it is long overdue. The other day the Minister refused to tell me when he would amend the long service leave provisions in a broader sense for the benefit of workers throughout the State; but today he has announced a slight improvement in this area.

The Minister referred to sweetheart agreements. To my mind, many employers are fairly happy with sweetheart agreements. By acting against those agreements, in effect the Government is saying that there is to be no more collective bargaining. At the same time, it says that any group of workers that is not organised into a union and is not registered cannot be recognised. It will not be able to do anything. It will certainly not be able to go to the court, because, as it is not registered, it will not be recognised. Because the Government says that this form of agreement cannot be entered into, it will not be able to negotiate with any employer. Any agreement made will have to be registered and, in effect, endorsed by the powers that be. I believe that that section, too, will be ineffective.

The Minister said that monetary penalties will be doubled. I do not think that that will have much effect. The maximum penalties set in a number of areas outside this are rarely imposed; and, if penalties are imposed, they are not very high. I do not think that that amendment will be of much use. Really, it is negative.

The amendment relating to the time for which arrears of wages can be collected is a good one, but again it is long overdue. I agree with the proposal to remove the provision under which a magistrate has discretion to allow a further six months, and to give an employee an absolute right of 12 months for which he can claim arrears.

I feel that I have covered most of the comments of the Minister and most of the aspects of the legislation as outlined. I hope many members will rise to speak in this debate. I would like to hear comments of Government members, because after all they represent workers—

Mr. Moore: We are the workers' party now.

Mr. YEWDALE: If that is the honourable member's way of looking at it—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: God help us if the member for Toowong represents the workers' party!

Mr. YEWDALE: My final comment, Mr. Hewitt, relates to the Minister's comments on certain offences provided for under the Criminal Code. That reference can only create further turmoil in the industrial sphere. This is legislation which was talked about in 1957-58 and is being enacted in 1975. Apart from the provisions relating to remuneration for females, long service leave and the other matter I raised, I do not see that this measure will be welcomed by the responsible trade unions of the State.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (12.43 p.m.): The Bill represents for this Parliament one of the moments of truth that every Parliament must face in various spaces of time, because with this Bill the Parliament is being brought face to face with one of the most crucial, one of the most frightening and one of the most abrasive issues of our time. The issue is simply: "Who rules the country? Who governs? Who has the right largely to determine the financial and social directions to be taken by our community?" Is the elected Government to be subservient to bodies not elected by the general community and whose aims, very often, are entirely opposed to those which the majority of the general community believe are in their best interests? Are we to accept, as is already happening in other parts of the world, that elected governments are to become merely the useless appendages of aggressive and socialist-oriented union officials?

Mr. Doumany: Don't ask the Opposition.

Mr. PORTER: The Opposition will need to answer these questions. I will explain exactly why in a moment.

The Bill requires that this Chamber ask itself: are we to have a continuance of responsible, participatory democracy in real terms in the country or are we to work towards having it in name only, with the real power resting in the hands of unions, as is already the case in the United Kingdom, where the government of the day elected by the people cannot make any responsible economic decision without first getting the approval of the trade unions? That is the issue. That is what the Opposition has to face up to. Does it believe that the Westminster pattern of parliamentary democracy should survive in this State? I say that it is indeed a massive and crucial issue, and we all know it. Opposition members know it just as well as Government members do. This issue is one which has been exacerbated by events over recent times to the degree that it cannot be ignored by any thinking, responsible person in the community. These are the reasons why it has surfaced often for discussion in the Government party rooms.

Some 18 months ago the Government parties set up a joint committee to look into this matter and I had the honour and privilege to be chairman. This seven-man committee included some members who have since been elevated to other positions—the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities and Mr. Speaker. The committee went to a great deal of trouble talking with people, including union people, and reading submissions and eventually came to certain conclusions. I do hope to some degree one can accept, and feel gratified with the acceptance, that some of the pressures arising from the committee's recommendations filtered through to the Minister's committee and to his officers and produced the measures in this Bill.

I make it quite plain that as far as I am concerned, and also I believe I speak for the overwhelming majority of the community, this Bill is a starting point only—it goes a part of the way towards achieving a proper balance between elected Government, the community and the trade unions which, in the best interests of the community and all trade union members, must be found—but it is a tremendously important step and certainly a forward step in a very difficult field.

I commend the Minister and those people associated with him for having the courage to proceed with this Bill knowing full well the contumely that would be heaped upon him by Left-wing spokesmen. I have made it quite plain that I regard this as a first step and that I expect further steps to be taken when experience shows, as I am quite sure it will, that the modest reforms in this Bill are effective and go a long way towards democratising unions and helping both the community and rank-and-file union members.

Opposition members should not make any mistake about this Bill. This is a vital test for them. Their attitude to this Bill will determine whether they will be out in the wilderness for 10 years or the next 30 years. If they believe, as one honourable member suggested by interjection, that this Bill is no more than union-bashing, the Opposition, speaking in this vein, will be seen as being against the best interests of the community in general and the rank-and-file union members in particular. They will be seen as doing no more than coming to heel like a pack of cringing curs and going in to bat for the Left-wingers, the radicals, the Communists and all the little sawdust Caesars who have made such a mess of union affairs. If the Opposition do this, they will stand nakedly revealed as being against the overwhelming tide of public opinion in this country which wants responsible unionism. They will be going against the huge mass of people who are deeply fearful of imminent economic disaster.

I say that this Assembly must recognise that the people have had their fill of undue industrial confrontation. They have had enough of manufactured and exaggerated disputes. They loathe strong-arm intimidatory industrial methods. They just do not believe that there is any virtue in senseless boss-bashing. They have had far more than enough of the bull-in-a-china-shop methods of socialistically obsessed shop stewards, many of whom are British and, having spent years wrecking the British economy, have now come to this country and, under the Left-wing union structure here, are doing their best to wreck our economy.

I should say that every true Labor member will support the Bill, and those who are against it—I presume they will include the honourable member for Archerfield—will show that they are clearly aligned with the Left Wing. This morning, the Left Wing revealed itself in plain terms, without any equivocation. Mr. Hamilton, who is a senior Trades and Labor Council executive officer and, of course, head of the Building Workers' Industrial Union in Queensland, said, "The workers won't cop this type of legislation." Notice the way in which Mr. Hamilton, without any consultation, identifies himself with the workers. He says in effect, "I speak for them and when I speak, let no dog bark." He went on to say that the trade union movement must be allowed to conduct its own affairs. This Mr. Hamilton is, of course, a leading executive member of the Communist Party of Australia, and what he said is precisely the union line that Opposition members apparently propose to support. In other words, they say that the trade union movement alone will determine what it does, how it does it, and when it does it.

I believe that it is quite impossible for any rational person to accept this poisonous, destructive and treacherous nonsense that Mr. Hamilton utters. Are we to believe today that strikes are purely the unions' own affairs? Are we to accept that the massive paralysing loss that the community suffers is nothing more than the private concern of unions? Does anybody in his right senses believe that the gross destruction of the ordinary citizen's rights, which so many strikes automatically entail, is nothing more than a domestic union matter?

Mr. Doumany: Ask the Opposition.

Mr. PORTER: I do ask them—and they seem to be strangely silent. Are we to believe that denying income to a man, his wife and family to the point of financial disaster for them, with perhaps life-long effects, is a matter with which only militant union bosses should be concerned? I cannot believe that intelligent Opposition members believe that for even a moment. They know that today strikes are the concern of the whole community, and no union can be permitted to bring an organised community to its knees with impunity. That day has passed, and the sooner we all recognise it the better. The fact is that overwhelmingly most of us do recognise it.

I say to the Opposition that every public-opinion poll that has been taken on this matter has demonstrated that two-thirds of the people, including people who vote Labor, want secret ballots in the conduct of union affairs. Do Opposition members believe that the things for which we stand, and which are included in the Bill, are supported by only those who hold the political beliefs espoused by those on my side of the Chamber? How in the name of heaven do honourable members opposite think we won the number of seats we did and they lost the number of seats they did? A tremendous number of Labor people have deserted the Labor Party. Why have they deserted the Labor Party? Because the things honourable members opposite stand for are Communist-inspired, Communist-dominated and Communist-oriented. And they will keep deserting in droves if honourable members opposite show by their opposition to this Bill that they will dance to whatever tune the Communists choose to pipe for them.

This Bill does certain moderate things. It provides for a secret ballot to determine whether a strike should be held or not. It preserves the basic rights of union members in terms of membership of unions. It stops them being intimidated, being threatened or being unduly proceeded against in terms of their membership—when they wish to join, when they wish to resign or when they wish to re-join.

The Bill reduces the capacity of union officials to act in an over-officious manner when they come to inspect working conditions. Those of us who have had any experience at all of this type of thing know that there are some union officials who go into a business or manufacturing enterprise and act like a Nazi gauleiter—as though they own the place and nobody has any right to deny them any right of access that they purport to have.

The Bill provides for a secret ballot for union officials on request but does not make it mandatory. Who can argue with that? All of these provisions are designed to put the power back where it really belongs—in the hands of the rank-and-file union members. Anybody who argues against this Bill, anybody who works up specious, involved and convoluted arguments that it is against the best interests of the trade unions, is, of course, in fact working against the interests of the trade union members. If trade union leaders are sincere in their prating about the democracy that operates in trade unions, then they must be cheering this Bill because it puts democracy in the one place where it can be effectively exercised—in the hands of individuals.

The Bill is a classic endeavour to give the trade union movement some sort of real control of its affairs as opposed to the actual control that some radical union bosses now exercise over them. I want to say something very briefly about the problems of coping with unions in today's situations. All of us recognise fully the role trade unions should play in our society; there is no doubt about that. Any suggestion by Opposition members that those who rise and support this Bill are anti-union is, of course, childish, infantile nonsense. We on the Government side are the real supporters of trade unions. The situation is, of course, that whereas once upon a time trade unions were desperately necessary in order to provide organised worker power against the great power of the bosses and the employers, now we have reached a totally reverse situation where, in a highly interdependent, complex, technological, industrial society, the power of trade unions—and the great conglomerates that they are today enlarges that power—to hold a community to ransom, to use blackmail and intimidation in order to disrupt the life of the community, is tremendous. That power has got to be checked, and checked it will be without a shadow of doubt.

Now, let us remember that we have particular circumstances today because of particular conditions. One cannot blame unions for wanting to get a larger share of the cake in an inflationary situation which makes them see or fear that their differentials, won by dint of great effort, are slipping away from them, and this has to be considered, too.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr. PORTER: I am not one of those who believe that union demands for higher wages are the sole, or even the major contributor to high inflation. The fact is, of course, that union demands are, in very large part, a product of run-away inflation. It is that run-away inflation which produces the turbulent, unruly and uneasy union situation that we find, but without doubt irrational wage demands do feed the inflationary forces.

It is important to look at the basic patterns that are leading to union hegemony in a place like the United Kingdom. I referred earlier to the British situation. Throughout the Western world today, one of the great fears is that nations like our own will succumb to what is now called the English sickness. The English sickness has grown from the obsessive concentration of successive Governments upon redeploying the national economy. The stage has been reached in Britain—and we in Australia are not far away from it—where some 60 per cent of the national income is handled by the Government. That means that in real terms Britain is already three-fifths a Communist, a collectivist or an authoritarian-controlled State—whatever one likes to call it. And we are nearing that situation. It is that situation of run-away inflation caused by this madness of attempting to realign and restructure the community that leads to union demands which are beyond what a community can afford.

It has been well said that successive Governments in Great Britain have been like a dog in a barnyard, which runs around and stops the hens from laying but is itself singularly unsuccessful in laying any eggs. It is only the private sector which can produce, and the private sector must be permitted to produce—and unions have to recognise that fact. We would do well to recognise here in Australia that already there are unhappy signs that the English sickness is with us. We must do what we can to cure it, but the cure will not be easy or pleasant. I repeat that the Bill is an important first step to assist Australia to escape from the crippling, the debilitating and probably the lasting effects of what is known throughout the economic world as the English sickness.

The Bill marks a first in Australia. In some respects it pre-empts aspects of the industrial policy that Mr. Malcolm Fraser has already announced for the Liberal Party and, I presume, for the Liberal-National Government when it comes into office, as it most surely will.

One asks: Will it work? Of course, it must be made to work. It can fail only if vindictive, professional saboteurs are able to make it fail. We must not allow that to happen. Trade unions are part of the fabric of our community, but they are no more and no less than many other vital parts of the fabric. The trade unions must be brought within the framework of responsible law.

They cannot be permitted to operate like any other over-powerful monopoly as though they were beyond the law. Trade unions, in their own interests and in the community's interests, must not continue to operate and exercise power without responsibility—the prerogative, it is well said, of the harlot down through the ages. The time for that is past, and trade unionists themselves recognise it. There is a tremendous role for the unions to play, and we all accept that. On our side of the Chamber we will all do our part in assisting the trade unions to fulfil a proper role, but the proper role is not for wilful, malevolent men to misuse the organised power of the trade unions in order to hold communities to ransom, in order to blackmail individuals or in order to achieve the destruction of the very society that harbours them.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (2.20 p.m.): I rise to congratulate the Minister on his introduction of this timely legislation. It will have a profound effect on the trade union movement, which over the years has proved to be a great asset to the working classes of all nations. Unfortunately, however, the management of the trade union movement in Australia has passed out of the hands of good Australians, and today it is controlled by people who have alienated themselves from our democratic way of life. This legislation, even if not approved by the Opposition, will be given the approbation of many thousands of Queenslanders and their fellow Australians. I sincerely hope that the Federal Government takes a leaf from our Minister's book and introduces a similar measure on the Federal scene.

Mr. Houston: What are you going to do with this legislation?

Mr. HARTWIG: In answer to the interjection I inform the honourable member for Bulimba that yesterday I was in the company at Emu Park of three coal miners whose livelihood had been denied them by their Communist-dominated unions. They are fed up to the neck with their unions' activities, which have led to their stand-down and existence without an income. What do they think of the Communists and socialists who are dominating the unions? Now can the honourable member for Bulimba see what we will do with this legislation?

Over the past quarter of a century the Communist movement has deliberately pursued a policy of placing its members into the executive positions of the major Australian trade unions. It has stacked union meetings to ensure that Communist representatives are elected to office. I know this because for many years while I used a pick and shovel I worked side by side with union members.

Mr. Houston: You gave them a raw deal.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member has never had a pick and shovel in his hands.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will come to order.

Mr. HARTWIG: Thousands of good and honest Australian workers are paying very dearly for the election of Communists to executive positions in trade unions. It is time that the rights of the individual were taken into account. Anyone who listened to Jack Munday during his hour-long interview on the A.B.C. on Sunday night—

Mr. Tenni: What about Carmichael?

Mr. HARTWIG: He's in the same boat. Munday, a leading Communist, boasted openly that he possessed a lever by which he was able to bargain, and he defined that lever as being direct militant action. He was not afraid to admit it.

What has Mr. Whitlam said? At the Blacktown Civic Centre, on the evening of 13 November 1972, he made the following comments.

Mr. Hanson: He was elected to power some days later.

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes he was, and let us compare the record of his Federal Labor Government with his statements on that occasion. He is on record in these terms—

"We shall give priority in public co-operation to setting up economic planning machinery with industry and employees representatives to restore strong and continuing economic growth."

What a phoney! He also said—

"Labor's first priority will be to restore genuine full employment—without qualification."

Mr. Frawley: Who said that?

Mr. HARTWIG: Whitlam said that. That is an extract from his policy speech.

Today, not three years later, honourable members opposite condone strikes in which the strikers have very little say, with an unemployment figure of 300,000 looming over the nation and bringing frustration, worry and depression on the people.

Mr. Whitlam also said that the great aims of Labor's industrial policy would be to "reduce Government interference". He has not interfered in anything. That is why the unions have run rampant. He has not exercised one iota of control at any time. He has lost control completely. Honourable members opposite who need confirmation of that statement should keep in mind what Bob Hawke said when asked on a TV programme what he thought about the present-day trade union

movement. He said, "I think I can see it out but in this nation I feel for the future of my children."

At this very time, a few miles to the north of this country, a nation has been invaded by a foreign power which is under the Communist regime.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member should return to industrial matters.

Mr. HARTWIG: In his book "The Quiet Revolution", Dr. Cairns has indicated how Australia will be taken over without a shot being fired. I should say that we have reached at least the half-way mark, even if we have not gone past it. The workers of this country have been used to further the aims and ambitions of socialists and Communist-inspired people.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: The Leader of the Opposition is very irresponsible.

Leaving that speech made by Mr. Whitlam, I come to 1974, by which time Labor had had time to put its policy into action.

Mr. Moore: Over a thousand days.

Mr. HARTWIG: Over one thousand people a week are becoming unemployed. In 1974 we experienced the worst industrial turmoil ever—and the Leader of the Opposition laughs! He is prepared to laugh while his fellow men are starving. The complete disregard for workers displayed by A.L.P. members in this Chamber and in other places in this nation shows their scant respect for the workers. If honourable members opposite do not believe me, how do they explain the savage increase in postage rates? That is a direct hit at the workers.

I was referring to the industrial turmoil in 1974. In that year there were 2,809 individual disputes involving 2,000,000 workers, who lost 6,300,000 working days and \$128,000,000 in wages. That was the worst turmoil in Australia's history and it occurred in a period of so-called industrial tranquility that Whitlam announced he would give the nation. It is time some Government stood up and defended the right of both the workers and the general public to combat the blackmail of Communist-dominated unions.

Mr. Marginson: What do you think about yesterday's decision? Weren't the miners right?

Mr. HARTWIG: Recently I had the pleasure of being in the Moranbah canteen with the Minister for Mines and Energy. The majority of the miners condemned the activities of their union leaders over the coal strike. Their livelihood was at stake. They had homes provided but no income.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: The member for Rockhampton North said, "Oh, Christ!"

Mr. Marginson: They were right in what they did.

Mr. Yewdale interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is what I thought the honourable member said.

Mr. YEWDAL: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. A point of order must be taken at once. The honourable member is too late.

Mr. HARTWIG: In the last week in July the manager of the Peak Downs coalmine told us that he had lost 29 working days—five weeks—through industrial action during the first six months of this year. I suggest, Mr. Hewitt, that the man who loses most from industrial unrest is not the union leader or the employer but the employee. In many ways this Bill will help the employee and his dependants. The coal strike cost this State alone tens of millions of dollars, so it is good to see some legislation that will bring sanity to bear in a strike situation by providing that a ballot will be taken.

Mr. Marginson: You don't think this legislation will prevent them going on strike, do you?

Mr. HARTWIG: If members of the Opposition are afraid of the decision that may be made by ballot—and obviously they are—the measure must be of benefit to the community. Opposition members seem to be very worried about the introduction of this legislation. I believe they should have no fears at all. The result will be a democratic reflection of the wishes of the men. If the men want to continue to strike, they will show it through the ballot-box. I see nothing objectionable in that.

Finally, I express the opinion that it is time something was done to remedy the problems existing in the industrial sphere. There seems to be a wave of rolling strikes—strike after strike after strike. Immediately one lot of workers returns after a dispute, another lot goes out. The pattern of strikes being engineered by the Communists throughout the nation—not just in Queensland—is obvious; it is a growing process of rolling strikes in an effort to cripple the nation so that we will be more vulnerable to an alien intrusion.

I commend the Bill and look forward to its passage through the House.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (2.34 p.m.): I thought honourable members on the other side of the Chamber would have taken sufficient interest in this legislation to tell the Parliament and the people of Australia what they see of benefit in this legislation as well as informing the people generally and the unionists in particular of the harm they see in it. Apparently, however, they are not interested enough to put forward their points of view so that they might be recorded for all time. I am rather amazed, in view of the number of unionists among the small A.L.P. shadow Cabinet, that members opposite have not jumped to their feet to take advantage of this debate.

I believe that the honourable member for Rockhampton North said during his speech that we had very shaky labour relations. That may be his interpretation but it is certainly not mine after speaking to a number of people who are considered to be working people, who are members of unions and who are absolutely dismayed at what has taken place since the Federal A.L.P. Government gained office in 1972. A large number of these unionists are very concerned indeed. I believe they are looking to the Queensland Government for some way out of the chaos and the anarchy among union leaders that are evident from day to day, week to week and year to year in Australia.

The honourable member for Callide quoted from the 1972 policy speech of the A.L.P. I also want to quote a passage of it because part of the policy speech highlights the desires of the Australian Labor Party in 1972, which are in direct conflict with the desires of the Prime Minister and other people within the A.L.P. Federal Government today. I think they have greatly changed their views on this matter in the very short space of three years. I refer particularly to the paragraph dealing with negotiated agreements. Mr. Whitlam said—

“Mr. McMahon has declared against industrial agreement through conciliation and negotiation. In so doing he has not only declared for a policy of confrontation; he has turned against the section of employees who most depend upon negotiation for their earnings and their conditions—the white collar, the salaried and professional employees. Eighty per cent of all agreements are reached not through the courts, but through negotiations. The more highly qualified an Australian is, the more likely it is that he will be an employee; and the more highly qualified he is, the more likely it is that he enjoys a negotiated agreement. For the Liberals to insist that awards must be made solely by courts is a declaration of war, not just on the industrial unions but on the overwhelming majority of professional and salaried employees.”

We are all aware of the statement made by the Prime Minister two days ago and the report in this morning's “Courier-Mail” of a statement made by the Leader of the A.L.P.

and the A.C.T.U. The Prime Minister and many of his front-bench colleagues have completely about-faced on conciliation and arbitration. I believe that the problems people have faced since 1972 have brought about a complete change of heart in the people of Australia and they are now looking to the Queensland Government to introduce sanity in place of chaos. And the chaos of course was, as I have just said, encouraged in 1972 by the Prime Minister and his henchmen.

Mr. Hanson: You are inflaming the situation.

Mr. MILLER: Far from inflaming the situation, I am trying to point out that we are introducing legislation in the Queensland Parliament to take out of this situation the flame that has been sparked by statements made by the Prime Minister and his henchmen since 1972.

The statement I quoted is only one of many I could attribute to the Prime Minister and a number of other Ministers in the Federal A.L.P. Government. They are the people who have inflamed the union leaders to take such steps as now face us. We now have the Prime Minister saying that we must have wage indexation. Of course, the legislation we are introducing today is a step towards helping the Prime Minister introduce wage indexation because what are most of the strikes about if they are not about wages? I agree that a few occur over conditions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation on my left.

Mr. MILLER: Whilst I agree that some strikes called on by union leaders are quite legitimate, many are caused by one union after another seeking the conditions that another union has received. This is what wage indexation is all about, and it is also what the coal strike was all about. The Federal Government did not want the coal miners to receive an increase—which they have now been granted—because that would negate wage indexation. That is what every strike is about now, which is why the Prime Minister came out so strongly yesterday in asking union leaders and unionists to get behind the Federal A.L.P. Government to make sure that wage indexation works. In the face of the chaos in Australia today, all right-thinking people would have to say, “Let us get behind the Prime Minister.” But that was not the stance adopted by Mr. Hawke, and I wonder what the position of A.L.P. members in this Chamber is? Will they support the Prime Minister, or will they support Mr. Hawke? I must agree that they are in a very invidious position.

Mr. Porter: They are getting their instructions now.

Mr. MILLER: It certainly looks like it; they are all huddled up in the corner.

I would have expected the Leader of the Opposition, rather than the Opposition shadow Minister, to lead for the Opposition, and to come out strongly in favour of the legislation. After all, what does it set out to do? The Government is saying to the workers of Queensland, "We intend to give you the right to choose whether you will go on strike or not." I was most surprised to read in "The Courier-Mail" last year that the Government proposed to introduce legislation under which unions were to be required to give a fortnight's notice before striking. What a ridiculous situation that would have been! Quite often strikes arise on the spot from ill feeling between employer and employee. Saying to unionists, "You cannot have a strike unless you give a fortnight's notice" would be too ridiculous for words.

I hope that the workers of Queensland will study the legislation; I hope that they will not simply take the word of union leaders on what the Bill contains. I hope the newspapers will state in fine detail what it involves. It allows the workers to choose for themselves whether they continue a strike that has been called by a union leader who believes that he is in the right, a shop steward who wants to make a king of himself, or a few dissidents in a union who believe that they have a just cause. I do not believe that all the workers in an industry should have to go out on strike because a few dissidents believe that they have a just cause. The legislation will say in effect to the workers, "You now have the say whether or not you go on strike." What more democratic action could be taken by any Government?

Mr. Houston: They have that right now.

Mr. MILLER: They do not have that right now, as the honourable member for Bulimba knows quite well. The legislation that is on the Statute Book at present is quite unworkable, and the honourable member has been very happy indeed to see it remain that way. Throughout the years union leaders have laughed not only at this Government but at every other State Government in Australia, irrespective of its political leaning, and every Commonwealth Government. They realise that in the holding of strike ballots the old Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act was inoperative.

The provisions of this Bill will make it much simpler to hold ballots, and the legislation will therefore be more effective. The honourable member for Bulimba usually makes a sound speech, and I have always found him to be very fair. I thought that he would have been one of the first to say that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, as it presently stands, is most unworkable and needs amendment.

Mr. Houston: It's your Act.

Mr. MILLER: Of course it is our Act, and we are about to amend it. But the honourable member for Bulimba a moment ago said that the workers already have the right that this Bill will confer on them. They most certainly do not. It was absolutely impossible for them to bring about any change by ballot should they so desire.

I believe Mr. Jack Egerton, the leader of the Trades and Labor Council in Queensland and a very highly respected member of the A.L.P., highlighted the problems when he spoke about industrial anarchy in August 1974. I just want to read to this Committee, and especially to the members of the Opposition, the last paragraph of an editorial in "The Australian" on 17 August 1974 referring to Mr. Egerton's remarks. It stated—

"The public image of the union movement has, as Mr. Egerton warns, been badly damaged by recent selfish strike actions which have principally depended for effect on the degree of hardship they have caused the public."

I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Hewitt, that no truer words were ever spoken. Frankly, I have come to admire Mr. Egerton in recent years for the way he has come out and stated exactly what he thinks of union action and union strikes. The editorial continues—

"Not all strikes have been unjustified, of course, but there has been an infuriating monotony of electricity strikes timed for the coldest periods of the year, petrol strikes coinciding with holidays, and train strikes arranged for travel peak hours. That kind of thing has to stop with the adoption of the anti-inflation defences we all hope will emerge from the Moore conference on indexation and subsequent government measures. But the fact that unreasonable strikes have occurred in the past must not prevent us from trying to achieve that package in order to avoid, among other things, industrial disaster."

There is not one person in this Committee who would disagree with the reported statements of Jack Egerton in 1974. Union leaders have certainly decided to take strike action when it best suited their argument and have put at a disadvantage the whole of the community. Now, of course, we are going to say to those unionists who are being asked to go on strike by their leaders, "You decide for yourselves whether you want to cause this chaos. You decide for yourselves whether you want to impose these restrictions, these hardships, on your fellow workers." I do not for one moment believe that union members are having their say at present. What percentage of union members attend a union meeting to decide whether or not to go on strike? I think I would be quite fair in

saying that fewer than 25 per cent would actually vote on whether or not the actions of their union leader should be implemented.

Mr. Burns: How do you make them go?

Mr. MILLER: I think that is a very valid question. It is very hard to make people go to a union meeting, but at least under this Bill which we are asking the Opposition to support, all union members will have the opportunity to vote on whether to go on strike, and that is the important thing. In recent years we have seen union leaders trying to vest themselves with the power of kings, and I refer particularly to the leader of the Transport Workers' Union, Arch Bevis, who lives in my electorate. I know he is a very sincere and dedicated unionist. I know also that he is trying to achieve untold power for himself and for his union.

Mr. Lamont: That is his idea of the sincere unionist.

Mr. MILLER: He is striving for power for himself and his union. He is a dedicated unionist and I have no argument about that. But I do argue about what he is endeavouring to do and I am very sorry that this Bill does not contain a provision which will stop self-employed truck drivers being forced to join the Transport Workers' Union. On what grounds does Mr. Bevis or any organiser of the Transport Workers' Union demand that self-employed workers not only join the union but contribute towards A.L.P. campaign funds?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That's not right.

Mr. MILLER: It is right. A subsequent Opposition speaker might like to tell us what percentage of union fees is paid to the A.L.P. towards campaign funds. I am concerned not about the amount of money that is passed over but the freedoms that are being taken away from individuals by the Transport Workers' Union. I am very disappointed that the legislation does not cover that aspect at all.

We heard the Minister refer to picketing being illegal in the vicinity of any site where a secret ballot is being conducted. I am only sorry that picketing such as that which takes place at Roma Street railway yards or at some of the large retail firms like Cut Price Stores, Woolworths and Coles, when the Transport Workers' Union demands that self-employed people join the union, is not also illegal. I wonder how many honourable members would expect any union to demand of them that they join the union when it is not in their own interests to do so. I have no argument against the joining of a union. I believe the unions do an excellent job for their members.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: As long as they don't upset the boss too much.

Mr. MILLER: As long as the union members have a say in what they have to do. But I am totally opposed to the trade union movement taking away the freedoms that we are supposed to enjoy under democratic government.

Mr. Burns: I am glad you said "supposed".

Mr. MILLER: That is right. That is why I am very sorry indeed that we are not legislating against that wrong which is being perpetrated by the Transport Workers' Union and its leader. I hope that in the very near future an amending Bill will be brought down to overcome the situation I have referred to. I admire the Minister for what he is doing here today. It must achieve only good. I believe that it will strengthen the hand of the Prime Minister, and in doing so it will help to overcome the problems that have been created by the A.L.P. Federal Government since 1972.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (2.53 p.m.): I have listened with great interest to the speakers during this debate. Before going into very much detail about the Bill as outlined, I should like to refer to some of the statements made by the honourable member for Callide. He suggested that the management of unions today is out of the hands of good Australians. I do not know where he gets his ideas from, but those exact sentiments were expressed in 1961 when the present Government brought in the legislation we are now amending. It is very strange that one Government member should say that that was great legislation, and that it was brought in to put union affairs back into the hands of good Australians, when the honourable member for Ithaca says that there are many things wrong with the existing legislation and it requires amendment. The Government cannot have it both ways, or is this another rift between the Liberal Party and the National Party on matters of Government policy?

While the honourable member for Callide was speaking, the honourable member for Barron River made the remarkable interjection that all trade union officials ought to be shot. Unfortunately that is the attitude of some Liberal Party and National Party supporters. They would say, "Don't debate it; don't argue with him. Just take him outside and shoot him." Such an attitude has led to the present increase in industrial unrest. A great number of Government supporters have, unfortunately, shown their hatred for trade union officials.

It was 14 years ago that the Act was introduced by Ken Morris, and apparently this is the first time since 1961 when the Government has believed that the Act called for amendment. The honourable member for Ithaca has suggested that it should be amended, and I agree with him. But it has taken the Government 14 years to determine that some of its provisions should be amended.

A number of the amendments outlined by the Minister are praiseworthy; others are absolutely ridiculous. The honourable member for Ithaca said, among other things, that the Bill is intended to give workers the right to decide whether or not they will strike. The Act already gives workers that right under sections 98 and 99, which provide for ballots before strikes. But those provisions were found to be impracticable.

Mr. Miller: That's right.

Mr. HOUSTON: In 1961 my colleagues and I warned the Government that they would be impracticable and would do nothing more than create further industrial strife. In fairness to the honourable member for Ithaca, might I say he was not in Parliament at that time. Most of his colleagues on the Government benches, particularly those in Cabinet, were here then, and they were unanimously of the view that the Act would bring about an end to strikes. We were told that, because the legislation was giving the rank and file the right to decide whether or not to take strike action, there would be no more strikes. As has been said, those provisions have proved to be a failure, and I am pleased to see that they will be removed from the Act.

For the benefit of the Minister I inform him that a member of a union affiliated with the Australian Labor Party would pay no more than 1 per cent of his union dues by way of party affiliation fees. That would be the cheapest membership subscription to any political party in Australia.

Mr. Lamont: Why should he pay anything?

Mr. HOUSTON: Many unions give their members the right not to pay such an affiliation fee. There is no compulsion whatever.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Bulimba is making his speech, and I intend to hear him. This constant cross-firing will cease.

Mr. HOUSTON: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt. I was saying that the union member pays only 1 per cent. No other political party in Australia offers such a low subscription for such privileges as those given in return.

Mr. Campbell: You say 1 per cent?

Mr. HOUSTON: It would be no more than 1 per cent.

Mr. Campbell: 1 per cent of what?

Mr. HOUSTON: Of his union fees.

Mr. Burns: In my union the fee is \$35, so they pay 35c.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is a fair indication of what occurs. I do not wish to mislead the Minister, but I am sick and tired of the claims that workers are compelled to join political parties.

The union member has the right to determine which candidate will be selected by the A.L.P. to contest an election. In contrast, no member of a trade union can go along to the Liberal Party stating that he would like, for example, Joe Blow to be the candidate for election. He can ask that Joe Blow be selected, but he has no say whatever in the selection of the candidate. As I say, every member of every union affiliated with the Australian Labor Party has the right to decide who shall be the candidate. Furthermore, he has a say in the formulation of party policy, and he enjoys other privileges as well.

As to the Bill itself—I listened with great interest to the Minister while he read his brief. I have to say that I believe he read it totally without conviction; he displayed no enthusiasm whatever. I know that the Minister is a loyal member of the Cabinet and carries out his duties as dictated to him by the Premier and the union-haters in the Liberal Party. What was behind this legislation became more evident when we heard from the honourable member for Toowong, the leader of the Right-wing movement in the Liberal Party. Unfortunately for the Liberal supporters, that is the faction which is wagging the tail of the Liberal Party. That was shown the other day when a free vote was held and the Right-wing Liberals lined up with National Party members on the now infamous vote for the election of a senator.

On many occasions the Premier has been likened to the Hitlers of history and, without doubt, the honourable member for Toowong wants to emulate Mussolini.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am prepared to allow the widest debate on industrial matters under this Bill, but I will not allow honourable members to get away from industrial matters. The election of a senator has nothing to do with industrial matters.

Mr. HOUSTON: I quite agree, Mr. Hewitt, but it brought out the attitude of honourable members in this Chamber.

The honourable member for Toowong asked, "Who is to rule this country?" It should be noted that he used the word "rule". As the honourable member read his speech—and I do not suggest that somebody else wrote it—he used the word "rule" advisedly. He said, "The Government must rule." The A.L.P. believes that governments should govern. Throughout history "rule" has meant domination. Years ago, the old kings, the Hitlers and the Mussolinis ruled nations—and they did so with an iron fist! The honourable member for Toowong once again wants to rule.

Mr. Hales: What about Stalin?

Mr. HOUSTON: Let us govern, not rule.

Mr. Porter: What about Whitlam?

Mr. HOUSTON: Stalin wanted to rule his country. So far as Whitlam and the Labor Party are concerned, we believe in governing this great nation of ours. Governing is what democracy is all about.

The honourable member for Toowong spoke of parliamentary democracy. That is a great joke in Queensland. We have everything but a democracy in this Parliament. We have rigged boundaries and, at the last election, the Government gained office on part truths, fear and abuse of candidates. Government members know full well what happened on that occasion.

The honourable member for Toowong outlined the Government's real policy. His words should be remembered by every trade unionist and every Queensland. They were restated by the honourable member for Ithaca when he said that this Bill was a starting point only. What is the next point? In my view it will be an attempt by the Government to introduce regulations to make the trade union movement, and trade unions, completely tame-cat. I believe the Government wants to regulate trade unions so that they become insignificant units in the community. Throughout this Government's term of office, Government members' speeches have shown that they are completely opposed to the trade union movement and all those associated with it. It is all very well for Government members to say that they are against only certain trade union leaders. If that is so why has the Government not attempted to amend in any way the regulations covering the election of union officials? That was not referred to at all in the speeches made by the honourable members for Toowong, Ithaca and Callide. Their speeches were based solely on attacking trade union officials in an attempt to show that they were elected illegally, or not by the unionists.

Almost all of the speech made by the honourable member for Toowong was an attack on trade union officials. Today, trade union officials are elected under the law passed by the present Government in 1961. Every trade union official has been elected under that legislation. Some have been elected by court-controlled ballots, and others without court-controlled ballots. I repeat that the leaders of all unions registered in the State have been elected under the law which this Bill does not attempt in any way to amend.

Mr. Miller: Who said it does?

Mr. Frawley: It might be—

Mr. HOUSTON: If the statement of the honourable member for Murrumba is true, what he indicates is that it might be in the Bill.

Mr. Frawley: How do you know?

Mr. HOUSTON: I act on the Minister's speech. I believe that a Minister tells us what is to be embodied in a Bill. On no occasion has the Minister indicated that there would be an amendment to that part of the Act. If the Bill does contain such an amendment, I do not consider that the Minister has carried out his duty.

The Government, of course, adopts a double standard—one for itself and one for trade unions.

A Government Member: How is that?

Mr. HOUSTON: The other day the Premier said that his Government would rule the State and he would not be told by anyone what he should do. By "anyone" he meant the electors who put him there. He said he would not be told what to do about a matter that I do not want to refer to in view of the Chairman's ruling. On the other hand, the Government says that it wants leaders of trade unions not to lead and not to govern; it wants them to be subservient at all times to their members. The Government cannot have it both ways.

I am all for responsible elections in trade unions. I urge every union member to vote at his union's elections. That is his right and privilege. However, when provisions are laid down giving him the right to vote and he does not exercise it, he has no-one but himself to blame if the officers elected are not to his liking. While we have the free trade union elections that we presently have, we should accept the decision of those who see fit to vote. I believe in upholding the right of those who are elected.

Mr. Frawley: Do you vote in one?

Mr. HOUSTON: I have voted in many union elections.

Mr. Campbell: You would be aware that the Waterside Workers' Union fines members who do not vote.

Mr. HOUSTON: That must be a provision contained in the rules, which are registered in the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Campbell: I am not complaining.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not denying that the Minister is right.

Mr. Campbell: I am making the point.

Mr. HOUSTON: I wish the Minister would give some of the Right-wingers here the same information as he is trying to give me, which I already know.

The point is that for unions of employees, the Government lays down pretty strongly how their officers will be elected; yet there are no laws governing how the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures or any other employer organisation shall elect their officers.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Through their organisations, they influence the Government. I have no fight if the Minister listens to their views.

Mr. Lamont: We had legislation last week providing for grammar schools. What are you talking about?

Mr. HOUSTON: That's a good old-schoolie interjection. It just shows, Mr. Hewitt, that the member for South Brisbane still thinks we are talking about grammar schools and education. Might I remind him that this is a Bill associated with the election of union officials.

Mr. LAMONT: I rise to a point of order. What I pointed out, in view of the challenge issued by the honourable member for Bulimba, was that as recently as last week we introduced a Bill, which is still lying on the table, providing for the manner of election of representatives—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. HOUSTON: He is trying to be a smartie by wasting time; but it is the time of the Committee that he is wasting, not mine.

The point is that the original legislation, which provided for penal clauses and for court-controlled ballots before a strike, has failed miserably. I am pleased that the Government is taking it out of the Statute Book. However, the substitute is just as ridiculous. Let us suppose there is a strike—and a strike can be brought about by many things—and it is said, "We are now going to have a ballot to decide whether the men will stay on strike." If the Minister is referring to the men out on strike, I would like him, in his reply, to tell us how the ballot would be conducted and, when a ballot is being held, how those who are on sick leave, holidays, long service leave and compensation—and in many cases they would represent a substantial number of people, sufficient to sway a ballot one way or the other—

Mr. Frawley: You are drawing red herrings.

Mr. HOUSTON: No, I am not. I am being as factual as I was in 1961, and if notice had been taken of my colleagues and me in 1961 the Government would not have been in the strife it has been in over the years. I want to know from the Minister how this will be done. If he goes further and says that he will allow anyone working in a place to have a vote, the situation becomes completely ridiculous. The Minister referred to a place of work. What about the organisations that have several places of work? Take a building site for example.

There would be certain employees working on the actual construction, other employees in other places making the parts required, and office staff, who may not be at the site; and they would have to be included. Staff employees would not normally be members of the trade unions that we consider to be the industrial unions. Are they to be given the right to vote? The whole situation will become chaotic. I warn the Government that if it tries to set trade union against trade union, it will have further and more vicious industrial troubles.

Mr. Frawley: Rubbish!

Mr. HOUSTON: Never mind about rubbish. The Government should take notice of people who have been in trade unions and have some knowledge and experience in handling men—and women for that matter, too. If the Government does anything that will incite one trade union to act against another, it will encounter very severe industrial trouble in this State. Let us suppose that in the power industry one union which is not maintaining par with the wage structure or for any of the many other reasons that could result in one section—

Mr. Elliott: Take the transport industry.

Mr. HOUSTON: Transport is involved in the power industry. It involves practically all trades and all unions. That is why I selected it. There could be a problem with transport and only a handful of men could be employed on that project.

Mr. Elliott: They could disrupt the whole thing, couldn't they?

Mr. HOUSTON: I know they could, but there must be other ways of handling this matter and I am saying that this is not the way to do it. What happens in practice is that one section could go on strike and the others, including the management, could decide to use their majority to overpower that section. Does the Government think that the men who went on strike over a vital principle would go back? Of course they would not. There will be a widespread strike instead of an isolated one. For the protection of its own members, a union will broaden the strike. I will use every word at my command to warn the Government not to go ahead with this legislation.

The Minister mentioned the use of police in strike-breaking. History tells us that in the early part of this century the police were used as strike-breakers; in fact, on occasions, special police were used with batons and the rest of it.

(Time expired.)

Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (3.14 p.m.): First of all I should like to inform the Committee that I was a member of a trade union for 22 years, so that honourable members can expect to hear a sensible submission after all the tripe they have heard so far from the two Opposition speakers.

Mr. Aikens: Were you always financial?

Mr. FRAWLEY: Certainly I was financial. I always paid my yearly membership in one hit, not three months at a time.

I should also like to draw attention to the lack of speakers from the A.L.P. Opposition. Of course we all know the reason: the printed briefs from the Trades Hall were not ready, or the taxi delivering them broke down. We have heard from two Opposition members and they made a pretty poor job of it.

This Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will certainly give workers a great deal of protection and the opportunity to participate in union decisions, which is something they do not enjoy now. Far too many union secretaries and presidents who are under the domination of Left-wingers and Communists—and there are plenty of them—call a strike at any time without any reference to the rank-and-file members of the union. As I said before, I was a member of the E.T.U. for 22 years. During that time we had only one strike that I know of and I have to admit that I voted for that strike because I thought it was reasonable. I have never been against trade unionists voting for a strike when they were given the opportunity to do so. However, I am certainly against any union that calls a strike without referring the matter to the rank and file.

Secret ballots controlled by the Industrial Commission, or any other responsible body, are certainly the only method that can be used to rid unions of some of those who pass themselves off as union secretaries and presidents and who are in those offices only as a means of gaining personal power. I do not include all union officials in that statement. Nobody could say, for instance, that the Queensland State Service Union was not controlled by moderates. The secretary of that union is a man whom I have known personally for 10 years, and he could never be described as other than a secretary who has the interests of his union at heart. Many other unions, too, are controlled by good, sincere men who have the interests of their members at heart. But unfortunately there are those that are controlled by Communists and Left-wingers. The Bill will give union members the chance to rid their unions of Communists and Left-wingers.

The honourable member for Rockhampton would support me if he were here, because there was a report in the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin" in which he was criticised by a Central Queensland union

member. This person said that he deplored the interference by the honourable member in union affairs. The report continued—

"The Central District secretary of the Australian Railways Union, Mr. F. Ashford, said yesterday he deplored the political interference in the legitimate activities of trade unions by Mr. Wright. Trade unions are quite capable of looking after their own affairs without the intrusion of Mr. Wright."

Mr. Wright did express concern about the number of strikes that were being called. This union secretary also said—

"The inference that unionists are afraid to express openly their views because of the fear of victimisation is without substance and reflects upon the intelligence of the worker".

There is in fact no doubt that many unionists have been coerced by standover tactics into either not voting at ballots or voting as certain sections desire.

Mr. Wright also suggested that secret ballots should be introduced to decide what action should be taken in industrial disputes. I have it here in black and white—I took a photostat copy of the newspaper—so the honourable member for Rockhampton should speak in favour of the Bill. He came out in print in favour of the proposals even before he heard about the Bill.

Mr. Aikens: It appears to us that you are a little sympathetic with the member for Rockhampton.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I like the honourable member for Rockhampton. One of these days I shall test his reaction to hypnosis to see if in fact he performs as I have heard he does.

Mr. Aikens: Why bring that up?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I notice the honourable member for Archerfield always turns white when we speak about that because he sits near him.

I should like to give examples of the things done by some union secretaries and organisers. I ask the Committee to listen to this statement by a member of the Electrical Trades Union. Although he might not be a supporter of the Communists, he is a pretty good Left-winger. He is Mr. R. J. Henricks, an organiser of the Electrical Trades Union. He is reported as saying—

"... 1975 looked like being the year when unions really involved themselves in environmental matters.

"Three big issues would be oil drilling on the Great Barrier Reef, sand mining on Fraser Island and the Iwasaki resort development at Yeppoon."

The report states that Mr. Henricks is the E.T.U. spokesman on the environment. He only discovered that he was an environmentalist when he became a union spokesman. He was a member of the Trades and

Labor Council—appointed group which investigated sand mining on Fraser Island. That statement was designed to inflame unionists and coerce employers.

I shall relate some of the other things done by this man in union affairs. In the 1972 State election, when I first stood for the electorate of Murrumba, an electrician was giving out how-to-vote cards for me and another member, at a joint polling booth at Samford. This fellow Henricks, with a man named Dempsey, another E.T.U. organiser, came up to him and demanded to see his books. After all, trade union officials are entitled to see the books of employers. They demanded to see his books on election day. They did this because he was a well-known man in the Samford district, and his presence at a polling booth would help those who were undecided to make up their minds for whom to vote. These union officials therefore decided that demanding to see his books was a means of getting him, a well-respected pillar of society, off the polling booth.

A Government Member: You still won.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Perhaps I was lucky. I shall be only another couple of seconds on this, Mr. Hewitt.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Someone tried to divert the honourable member from his digression. I think he should now return to the subject under discussion.

Mr. FRAWLEY: This has a lot to do with the Bill, Mr. Hewitt. I am pointing out how members of the Electrical Trades Union should certainly get together to throw these fellows out of the union, and the way to do it is by means of a union ballot.

By coincidence, on 7 December 1974, the same electrical contractor was handing out how-to-vote cards, again for me. These two fellows again approached him and said that they had to see his books immediately. Isn't that laughable? It was only a coincidence that these two were conducting a campaign for the honourable member for Pine Rivers! This particular man was handing out my cards and also the cards for the present—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! With all the tolerance in the world, I point out that the honourable member is moving too far away from the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It just goes to show, Mr. Hewitt, the lengths to which some so-called trade union organisers will go in the pretence of carrying out their duties. In other words, these men are not fit to be organisers of any trade union.

Mr. Aikens: Tell us a bit more about the honourable member for Rockhampton.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not intend to be side-tracked; I am going to stick strictly to the provisions of the Bill. I do not believe in getting onto any side issues, much as I would like to. The time will come when I can tell a few stories about that. Actually, the honourable member for Rockhampton does subscribe to the idea of secret ballots. He has made statements to this effect in the Press. He certainly believes trade unions should have secret ballots although Mr. F. J. Stack, the secretary of the Transport Workers' Union in Rockhampton, said that Mr. Wright's statement was just an attempt to obtain political mileage over the issue. This may or may not be true.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that back in 1974 the leaders of some Communist-controlled unions said that they had decided they were going to use all their considerable trade union power to bring about a general nation-wide strike of the Australian work-force in the early months of 1975. How the devil can Carmichael (the Assistant Secretary of the Australian Metal Workers' Union and a Communist) and Halfpenny—these two idiots are colleagues of Jack Munday and all honourable members have heard of him—decide that trade union power is going to be used to bring about a nation-wide strike? Why should two men like that be able to make such a decision. Of course, they control the key union in the metal industry, the A.M.W.U., with a membership of 180,000 and a gross annual income of \$3,000,000. This gross income is expected to grow to over \$7,000,000. In the transport industry we have the Seamen's Union, the railway unions, the Waterside Workers' Union and the mining unions.

In one group of these unions there are no fewer than 230 Communist Party members in executive positions, and 150 are full-time officials. The Communists have approximately 35 full-time officials in the Metal Workers' Union, 25 in the Waterside Workers' Union, 25 in the main building industry unions and 8 in the small but very powerful Seamen's Union. There are hundreds of thousands of members in the Metal Workers' Union with an annual income of millions of dollars and it does seem wrong that a mere assistant secretary should be able to say that unions were going to cause a lot of strikes in 1975.

It is interesting to note that on 2 June 1972 Mr. Whitlam was addressing the Federal Council of the Metal Workers' Union—the one to which Carmichael belonged—and asking for a donation to the Labor Party's 1972 election campaign fund. This is interesting in view of the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition that very little union money went into the Labor Party campaign funds. The union leadership—the Communists and the Left-wingers—insisted on the abolition of the sanctions in the Arbitration Act. Mr. Whitlam said he might not be able to get such a Bill through the Senate but that much of what could not be done by law could be done administratively

and that without the consent of the Attorney-General prosecutions could not take place. He promised there would be no prosecutions, and the next day Carmichael's union kicked in with a cheque for \$25,000 to the campaign fund. The same union gave \$30,000 to the campaign fund during the last election. There is a union that kicked in \$55,000 just on the say-so of the Prime Minister that there would be no prosecutions for breaches of the Arbitration Act.

If there is a general strike in 1975 will the Federal Government enforce the provisions of the Arbitration Act? It is doubtful and this is one of the reasons why this Government is attempting to bring in this Bill—to see that any strike in Queensland, even though it might be promoted and used by southerners, will be a legal one. There is no doubt that most of the strikes in this State are southern-inspired. I do not believe there are many Communists in Queensland with the brains to organise these strikes. The Communists always send someone up from the South, as they did when the black power movement was in the news. They sent a mob of Aborigines up from the South to try to stir up these people.

I am not digressing, Mr. Hewitt, although I see you looking at me suspiciously. I am merely attempting to show why the Government has to introduce a Bill of this nature. The ordinary trade unionists should wake up. They should toss the Communists out of office, whether in the unions themselves or on the shop floor. The only way to do that is by secret ballot.

A strike wave for 1975 has been planned by the Communist Party of Australia. It even sent a person to Japan to investigate the methods used by the Japanese in their spring offensive early this year. That person's name was Marks. He reported his impressions of the union campaign in Japan in the "Tribune". He said there would be tremendous scope in Australia for a national industrial campaign involving both economic and political issues. Laurie Carmichael expounded on his plan for a national industrial campaign in Australia. He sees that Communists are appointed as shop stewards. He regards that as an essential factor in mobilising the workers for a national strike. Many good union members never bother to attend monthly union meetings. When I was a member of the E.T.U. I certainly never attended any meetings. I know the honourable member for Windsor did, because he was very interested in Electrical Trade Union matters.

Mr. Moore: And they sacked me.

Mr. FRAWLEY: They threw him out of the Electrical Trades Union because—

Mr. Moore: Because I had been out of the trade for three years.

Mr. FRAWLEY: That was the reason that was given, but really it was the pack of lies that was told by the former member for Everton. He said that the honourable member for Windsor and I had fixed the lift at Parliament House. The secretary of the E.T.U., Mr. Kane, is a well-known Left-winger and supporter of Communists. He called the honourable member for Windsor and me scabs, and said that we had fixed the lift in Parliament House.

Mr. Aikens: He was the first man to use the lift after you fixed it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I didn't fix it. I am denying that. We didn't fix the lift at all. We just closed the gate that someone left open. The former member for Everton told a pack of lies in this Chamber about the honourable member for Windsor and me. He was George George's stooge. He sat down in the streets during the Springbok disturbances. He even tried to get a job as secretary of the R.S.L. Services Club at Gaythorne after he was deposed by the present member. It is shocking to think that a man can stand up in this Chamber and tell a pack of lies about two such honourable members.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Would the honourable member please come back to the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am sorry, Mr. Hewitt. I was distracted, not maliciously but accidentally.

I fully support the Minister. I am not on the Minister's committee so I have no axe to grind by patting him on the back. I refute the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition—I am sorry, a former Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Bulimba. I forgot for the moment that he had been knifed.

Mr. Aikens: His back hasn't healed yet. The wound between his shoulder blades is still weeping.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I ask the honourable member not to distract me any more or I will be incurring the Chairman's wrath.

I refute the statement made by the honourable member for Bulimba that the Minister's heart was not wholly in his job. The Minister's heart is in his job. He is the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs. He has the interests of the workers at heart. He did not introduce the Bill with reluctance, but in his usual quiet manner. Unlike the member who used to eat cane toads, he does not froth and foam at the mouth. He makes a sensible submission. Because he does not throw his arms about and carry on crazily, there is no reason for anybody to say that his heart is not in the Bill he is introducing. Certainly he is not acting under instructions

from anybody. I have much pleasure in supporting the Minister in his introduction of the Bill. I shall have more to say on it at the second-reading stage.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (3.29 p.m.): As a man who has suffered much because of his loyalty to the trade union movement, a man who lost his job for several months on end and walked the streets looking for work, a man whose family almost starved because of his trade union principles and, incidentally, a man who saw people who scabbed on him during strikes come into this Chamber later as A.L.P. members of Parliament, I think I am qualified to say a few words about this industrial measure. Frankly, I regard it as merely a waste of time and effort even to debate it. I have spoken on many amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act but all of those amending Bills have been merely words written on water. This Bill, too, will be nothing more than words written on water.

There is plenty of power under the Act to deal with the situations outlined by the Minister and by the member for Toowong, who at least knows what he is talking about. The Government, however, has not made use of that power, for the simple reason that it hasn't got the guts to do it. It hasn't got the guts to implement its own legislation.

There are many things that will prevent this Bill from being worth-while legislation. First of all, there are two large spheres of trade union activity—federal and State. And there are two types of industrial tribunals—federal and State. Furthermore, trade-unionism in Australia is organised not on an industry basis but, in line with the system prevailing in Great Britain, on a craft basis. In some industries 15 to 16 trade unions have members working. In the railways alone approximately 29 trade unions have members employed. It takes the members of only one craft, such as the electrical tradesmen or the engine-drivers—or the nit-pickers or dag-pickers—to decide that they will stage a strike for the whole of the particular industry to be thrown out of gear. Thousands of people are thrown out of work as the result of the action—more often than not, totally irresponsible action—of a handful of men. That is one reason why this Bill will fail.

I have already commented on the Government's lack of courage. On an earlier occasion in this Chamber I referred to an incident that occurred one night at Charters Towers when a train was pulled up at mid-night nearly a mile from the railway station. The driver and fireman were ordered off the locomotive by militant members of the Australian Railways Union and the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen, and instead of taking their train in to the station and putting the locomotive over the pit, as had been done by members

of the union for as long as I could remember—and, with the exception of a paid position, I held every post in the A.R.U. that it was possible for a member to hold—they walked off supinely, leaving the train where it stood. A fettler's wife who was taking her sick baby to the Charters Towers hospital and had with her two other young children on foot was forced to walk from the carriages at the rear of the train over the sleeper ends, the ashes and the other obstacles in her way to the station while she was jeered at by some of the yahoos from the union.

I raised that matter in this Chamber and asked the Government to deal with the men who were responsible. Of course, it did nothing; it squibbed. The A.R.U., in one of the biggest jokes in the trade union movement, wrote to me telling me that it had cancelled my honorary membership. I had never held an honorary membership of the A.R.U.; after I left my job I paid my full union fees and, by a devious process, I still pay them.

One of the worst aspects of trade-unionism is the body-snatching that goes on between unions. It is referred to as demarcation disputes. Even where an employer is neutral and says to the trade unions involved, "I don't care which union this man belongs to. I employ him and you can fight out among yourselves which union he will belong to", the unions go on strike and throw the employer's operations out of gear. Sometimes these strikes last for weeks, simply because two unions are fighting between themselves over the membership of the employee concerned. I maintain that a demarcation dispute involving a neutral employer should be dealt with under the Criminal Code and that the union officials who spark off such a dispute and prolong it should be arrested on a charge and be made to stand trial. But what is the good of my wasting my time telling the Government these things when I know it has not the guts to do them?

I know something about trade-unionism, how it works and the problems associated with it. I was rather amused at the remarks and speeches of those whom I may term the "young theorists" in this Parliament, although I suppose I should give them credit for at least trying to be interested. I speak of the men who came to this Parliament last December. That was a big shock to everybody, but a bigger shock to themselves. They advocate all the theories in the world for solving the very complex problems that beset the industrial world and the trade union movement. These complexities cannot be solved by theories, but only by men who know the game from the ground up—men who know what the problems are and are game to face them.

The simple problem is this: we cannot win any battle in this world simply by bluffing. Sooner or later—as we did in the West—we have to take our opponent out

behind the windmill and get stuck into him just as he gets stuck into us. Sooner or later there must be a confrontation or we waste our time and expose ourselves as hypocrites. Until we adopt this firm attitude we will get nowhere. This legislation is merely a bluff. The unions will laugh at it knowing that it will be absolutely futile.

Reference has been made to secret ballots. Secret ballots are held in many trade unions. But how many workers vote in a secret ballot? I believe that the secret ballot in the Australian Railways Union is just as good as it was when I was a member. In those days, the union was very lucky to get 35 per cent of the members to vote in a secret ballot. Although the secret ballot paper was posted with a stamped, addressed envelope, to members only 35 per cent of them would vote. Honourable members should go along to see what happens when an open ballot is held. Of 2,000 members, at the most 300 to 400 would turn up. Indeed, three or four hundred would be a big crowd for a union with a membership of 2,000. When a strike is proposed, some members may be opposed to it. Have Government members ever been to one of these meetings to see what happens to those who do not believe in taking strike action? Have they ever witnessed the abuse, the assault and slander—anything at all? Many striking members, after leaving a union meeting, take out their spite on the homes of those members who do not believe in strike action. Quite recently, in Townsville, an old fellow was involved in a demarcation dispute. He was not concerned, but the strikers got boxes of rotten tomatoes from the C.O.D. The following morning that unfortunate worker's home was spattered with rotten tomatoes from the ridge-capping down to the front gate simply because he did something that his union or the court may have told him to do.

If honourable members want to know how the system works, they do not have to take any notice of me, nor do they need a remarkably retentive memory. They have only to think back to the visit of the Springboks. The trade unions, led by some of the militant, rat-bag type of officials, went completely haywire. Similar things will happen if the Government thinks it can control the trade union movement. The rank-and-file trade unionists knew that they were being used for the cheapest and dirtiest of political motives, but they were not game to do anything. Would an honourable member have gone to the front of the Tower Mill Motel when the crowd was there—Gerry Jones, Senator Georges and the rest of them, and all the yahoos, louts and scum section of the university? Would any honourable member have gone up when the police charged them and chased them down the hill? The next night Mr. Whitrod himself went along and pacified them. He said, "There will be no more charging. We

will not have any rough stuff." Instead of mention in the Honours List of the name of the inspector who chased the rabble down the hill, what did we get but rumpers and rat-bags and all sorts of peculiar creatures who had rendered no service at all to the community? Let no Government member tell me that the Government intends to control the militant element in the trade union movement! The Government has not the belly to do it.

Trade-unionism is vital. We must have it. It has brought the workers of this country and the workers of the world from the dark ages of slavery, depression, misery and destitution to a reasonable standard of living. Consequently, there is no greater believer in compulsory trade-unionism than I, but unfortunately trade-unionism has had foisted upon it all the bludgers and all the blood-suckers in the trade union movement.

Once compulsory trade-unionism is an established fact and the trade union officials are allowed to run it as they presently do, to the rank and file members of the union it becomes a worthless, useless thing. Once a trade union official knows that every person employed in a particular industry has to join his union, he sits back and does nothing. He is concerned only with collecting the union fees and giving himself a bigger rise, buying himself a bigger car, setting himself up in a bigger office and providing himself with much more attractive office girls. As far as he is concerned, the rank-and-file unionist can go jump in the lake. These are some of the problems that have to be faced.

Let us be honest. As the Minister and the member for Toowong have said, there is discontent among the workers of Queensland and there is discontent among the workers of Australia. That discontent is very deep-seated. It is not just a concern with what is happening on the job. I would say that the greatest discontent among the workers today is about the amount of money they lose through strikes that have been called—strikes that have been forced on them by their own trade union officials and about which they have known nothing. How often does a man pack his crib and drive to work only to find that a strike has been declared and pickets are on the gates? Sometimes the pickets on the gates are not members of his union at all. He has to return home and stay there until trade union officials declare the strike off. While the strike is on, none of the trade union officials lose one cent in salary, or any of their working conditions or perks. I did not hear all the Minister's introductory remarks, but if he has made provision that when a strike is held every official of the striking union will lose his salary, perks and allowances, he will have gone some way towards a partial solution of the problem.

Last week-end in Townsville I was made aware of the case of a very fine young worker—a moderate trade unionist who previously did not indulge in any strike-inciting activities but who today is almost a raving militant. He and his wife and two kids live in a home in Townsville on \$144 a week. He is paying off his home. By the time he pays his rates and insurance, keeps his wife and kids, runs a car and pays everything else, he has very little left. However, just up the road from him four bludgers live in a house owned by a mate of theirs. They are all on social service plus \$8 per week, what is called supplementary assistance. The mate who owns the house is on social service. There is nearly \$200 a week going into that house for people who do not work, never have worked and do not intend to work. I know that that is not the fault of the Minister in charge of this legislation; I know it is not the fault of the State Government; but that goes on. There is general discontent among the workers today, but this Bill will not do anything about it.

The workers are sickened. They realise that they have become the playthings of political propagandists. If a strike were honestly staged in the interests of the workers to try to get them better wages, conditions and all the things that are near and dear to their hearts, they would be in favour of it; but only about one strike in 20 is on genuine industrial and unionist grounds. Nineteen strikes out of 20 are purely political propaganda stunts. How will the Minister stop those? Will he take action under this Bill to stop the strikes that are declared by trade union officials simply to bolster some policy of the A.L.P., or probably (which is more likely) some policy of the Communist Party? That is what is happening today. Our strikes are not for the purpose of improving wages and conditions; our strikes are not staged to improve the working conditions and the outlook of people; in 19 cases out of 20 our strikes are purely and simply political propaganda stunts.

Many of the unions are run by limelighting officials who like to parade themselves as, shall I say, saviours of mankind. Have a look at some of those who are walking around Townsville. It makes me sick just to look at them. They rush to the Press and give statements about this and statements about that but very few statements about the working conditions of their trade union members. They say they are going to do this and they are going to do that. Is it any wonder that the workers do not go along to meetings? Sometimes meetings are not called but if they are, the members know that if they went along they would not get a chance to speak.

There is competition among the trade union officials to see whose members get better working conditions than others. This is the sort of thing that is going on. It is

so complex that it will not be solved by this sort of legislation. It will only be solved by a Government with the guts to implement the power that is already in this Act.

Nobody wants to see a confrontation between the trade unions and the employers any more than I do but it is time we had a confrontation between the Government and certain trade union officials who are not interested in the welfare of their members, who are not interested in the welfare of this country and who are not interested in the welfare of the wives and kids of their members. They are interested only in big-noting themselves—the Egertons, the Bevises, the Thomsons, the Emerys, and people like them that we have both here and in Townsville. They are interested in nothing but big-noting themselves and parading themselves as the industrial dictators of Queensland.

As I say, a union has rightfully a most remarkable position and a very worth-while function to fulfil. Trade unions should be public benefactors. In the old days they were. Their officials had to do a good job or they would be tossed out at the resultant trade union ballot. Most trade union ballots today are rigged. Even those that are not rigged are not voted at by members who are sick and tired of the rottenness and corruption among the officials in the trade union movement. They are no longer interested.

While all of this goes on, what do we do? We stand in this Chamber and beat the air. The Minister, adopting all the piety of attitude of which he is capable, introduces a Bill. I do not doubt his sincerity. Some honourable members would not know a trade unionist from a beer bottle but they talk for hours on end giving their theories of what should be done about this complex situation.

This Bill will become law and go on the Statute Book. I suppose the best thing that could happen to it when it becomes law would be to have it serve a useful purpose, perhaps in the toilet or hanging alongside a shaving mirror. It will never be implemented.

No-one can kid me that there is any meat in this Bill. As a man who has given his whole life—and it has been a long and useful life—to trade-unionism, Labor principles and the representation of the ordinary people, I will not be kidded that this Bill will do one scintilla to remove the problems that confront us today. We will still have strikes declared on the spur of the moment.

One union in Townsville had a strike regularly every Wednesday afternoon because the militant members of that particular union wanted to go to the T.A.B. each Wednesday afternoon. That sort of thing went on and on until the workers got a T.A.B. located closer to them. It is no good trying to kid me that this Bill will do any good for anyone.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DOUMANY (Kurilpa) (3.49 p.m.): I wish to speak in support of this Bill and to commend the Minister on a great deal of common sense and innovation. Whilst I accept much of the wisdom that the honourable member for Townsville South has expounded during his speech, I believe that this Bill touches all of us and that we all have a right and a duty to think about it and speak about it with all reasonableness.

We should look at some of the background material leading up to the introduction of this Bill and that made action essential. I shall do that before dealing with some of the comments made by honourable members opposite, particularly the honourable member for Bulimba who, without giving an alternative, said that this proposal is not the right way of achieving what is sought.

Let us look at some of the economic facts confronting this nation today. If we are to debate a Bill such as this in the present economic climate, and with the present hardships both suffered by and threatening many families, it is most important to look at some of the factors that underlie the thinking behind the Bill. In 1974, which is the last full year for which statistics are available, the number of working days lost in Australia through industrial disputes rose to 6,292,500. That is a massive number when compared with the previous highest over the preceding five years, which was approximately 3,000,000. In other words, in 1974 the previous highest in that five-year period was doubled. If we look at estimated losses in wages in 1974 as a result of industrial disputes, we see that in round figures they amounted to approximately \$128,301,000.

Those figures do not tell the whole story; they are just direct consequences. Let us now look at some of the repercussions of those losses in working days and wages. We do not have to look far when we see the state of the economy around us. Consider, for example, last month's figures for unemployment in Queensland. This is a simple measure, but a very real one. The actual figure was 4.6 per cent, and, seasonally adjusted, because this is a very good time of the year, the figure was 6.51 per cent. They are statistical measures of the State's economic performance and the well-being of its work-force against which we must view the Bill. They are not very good figures, and they demonstrate how imperative the Bill is as an attempt to take a positive step.

I do not think that we need reminding about inflation. With the hardships caused by days lost through strikes, wages lost through strikes, unemployment and the threat of greater unemployment, there is an inflation rate, hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles, of 17 per cent at the very least. The Federal Minister for Labor and Immigration (Senator McClelland) and the Prime Minister have, only in the last week, told the

workers of Australia that inflation could reach 35 per cent if the economic tide cannot be turned.

Mr. Moore: We have to throw them out.

Mr. DOUMANY: There is more to it than that; it is a question of taking action. I believe that the Bill does a number of important things. It takes illegality out of strikes. That is a very important principle. We all know that if the trade union movement is to function effectively in achieving its ends, it must have the power to strike. No-one denies that. But I believe that every right, including the right to strike, carries responsibility, and that every individual has responsibilities.

The trade union movement, with many others, has an interest in the economy, but in this respect it has much the same problem as companies. Trade unions are corporate bodies and, unfortunately, it is very easy for what is undesirable, for what is unwarranted and for what is unjustified to be masked behind a corporate shield. I believe that with this Bill the Minister is striving to introduce an onus of responsibility at the individual level, and I am sure all honourable members know that there is nothing better than individual responsibility to bring about better decision-making and more reasoned thinking. What this Bill is setting out to do is to allow individuals to make their own decisions untrammelled by pressure, should such pressure exist.

I believe that what the Bill is setting out to do is protect the right of the worker not only to strike but also to end a strike; and this is a very important principle. Surely the right to end a strike is just as vital a principle as the right to commence a strike. In this Bill we have embodied the legal right to strike but we have also tried to protect the workers' right to end that strike. Let us just look at this principle. Is the right to end a strike in the interests of the worker only? Surely not! There are the interests of his own family, the interests of his community and the interests of his fellow trade unionists in other fields. What better example could we have than the problems with coal and power not only in Queensland but also in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales over the past two years.

The power crisis in Queensland over the past three or four months affected us all very badly, but it is part and parcel of one of the key issues in industrial action, and that is that up till now there has not been an adequate right given to individual workers to end a strike. Just to highlight this particular point, I want to quote from a letter published in "The Queensland Times" of 24 July this year. It is headed, "Miner's wife begs for strike end." The letter reads—

"Dear Sir,

"I am a coal miner's wife who is fed up with strikes, overtime bans and all the rest of the trouble.

"Since May we haven't had a decent pay. We have been married over 20 years and have two children to rear and are still paying off our home.

"After struggling for years we decided to go on a trip at the beginning of the year and spent more than we really should.

"Since going back to work there has been nothing but trouble.

"I know that the union men are elected by our miners, but I think it is now time for a change. What right have they to put in the papers when the miners are to have days off?

"The men should have some say in this themselves.

"Last week we received two days' pay out of which \$1.80 was taken by the union.

"The meeting last Friday was a fiasco, two men from each mine decided to continue the bans.

"Come on you miners have a meeting yourselves and tell the union what you want. Don't be ordered around by New South Wales. Queensland is a different State and different rules should apply for us

"I'm not just talking through my hat. I am a coal miner's daughter and also had four brothers in the mines. So I know you don't get things easy.

"But enough is enough. I'm sick and tired of telling my kids 'no' to everything they want.

"I've spoken to some miners and they are pretty fed up too the way things are going. All they want to be is allowed to work and earn a living like everyone else.

"I am not a working mother, so we depend on my husband's pay packet.

"Fed Up Miner's Wife."

I am not saying that every one of the points made is cogent or germane to this debate, but one theme runs right through that letter and that is that there is a lot more than just a prima facie case for unions to have the right to strike; there is the concern and the compassion we must have for their families, for their fellow citizens and for the nation as a whole. That comes right through in this letter. I am sure none of us could dispute the validity of the claims made by this woman.

We have been told a good deal about the fact that things at present are all very rational. I am talking now not about the honourable member for Townsville South but members of the Opposition, particularly the honourable member for Rockhampton North. He is a very reasonable man, as I think everyone here would agree. He presents his case lucidly and without excessive emotion. I have a great respect for his debating ability. But I am sure he has not deluded many of us into believing that things are quite as rosy in the garden as he makes out, that everybody is so reasonable when it comes to reality, that there is

not pressure from extremists and that good decent people who constitute the great body of the trade union movement are not coerced from time to time in some fashion or other. Whether the coercion is open or covert is not the point. The fact is that there is room for coercion and there is room for pressure. And there is room for those who are strong, or, to put it more bluntly, strong-armed, to make their presence felt.

Let us look at some of the comments that have been made about certain strikes by members of the A.L.P. who are very well known to us. First of all I will refer to a statement made by Mr. Dunstan, the Premier of South Australia. He is a reasonable man. "The Australian" of 25 July 1975, dealing with the dispute that brought about the power crisis in South Australia, reported—

"In Adelaide Mr. Dunstan interrupted a post-election holiday to call an emergency Cabinet meeting, initially to discuss power rationing but finally, as conditions worsened, to close the station down.

"He said the picketing was completely improper, was adversely affecting other workers and that social pressure should be applied to the striking metal workers to remove their picket."

There is the opinion of a Labor Premier—probably the most eminent Labor Premier in years. I now turn to the high priest of the A.L.P.—the man who wears two hats—Mr. R. J. Hawke. He would probably like to forget the article in "The Australian" of 22 September 1973, which reported—

"Hawke attacked for 'bastardry' remark

"The Australian Railways Union yesterday criticised the ACTU president, Mr. R. J. Hawke, for his attack on a 24-hour strike by Sydney guards on Wednesday.

"Mr. Hawke said the rail guards' strike, which was over a demarcation issue, was an act of 'bastardry.'"

We have all seen a great deal of Mr. Hawke on television and we all know how he uses the Queen's English. From what we have seen of Mr. Hawke we would all know that he had a certain meaning in saying that. We know that what he meant was that that particular situation was thoroughly unreasonable, unwarranted and bad. It could not be interpreted in any other way.

We are not dealing with just an academic issue as to whether the Minister has presented the ultimate solution for the handling of industrial disputes. We are dealing with a situation where unemployment is at its highest level for about three decades, where inflation is at its highest level ever, and where productivity and total production are declining. In short, the nation is faced with little less than an economic catastrophe, and both the employer and the employee should adopt reasonable attitudes in the industrial sphere.

The Minister is bringing forward a measure that will preserve not only the trade-unionist's right to strike but also his right

to end a strike. It is an outstanding piece of legislation and one that must rank as the most innovative and important measure to be introduced in this Chamber in this session. I commend the motion to the Committee.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (4.6 p.m.): The honourable member for Kurilpa has referred to the coercion of union members. I remind him of the manner in which the members of the National and Liberal Parties were coerced some two weeks ago in the selection of Mr. Field as senator.

To turn to the motion before the Committee—this is not good legislation. In fact it may be described as jackboot legislation. Apparently the Government believes that what was good enough for Hitler's Germany is good enough for Queensland. The implementation of this Bill would be intolerable to the people of Queensland.

Mr. Byrne: Why?

Mr. MELLOY: My contention will be borne out by what occurs after the passage of this measure, which is nothing more than an attempt by the Government to do with a sledge-hammer what it has not been able to do with sound common sense and good government. It has failed to control the industrial affairs of this State with the legislation that already exists.

I see the Bill as nothing more than a political ploy. With the introduction of court-controlled ballots to determine whether or not the workers will go on strike, all the Liberal and National Party branches throughout the State will coerce their members to vote as the Government dictates. The Government will be given the power to control its members in the way that they should vote in union elections. Concerted efforts will be made by the Government parties to see that their members vote according to the whim of the Government. The Bill is unwarranted and unnecessary.

Mr. Byrne: Why?

Mr. MELLOY: Because the present legislation is sufficient to enable the Government to do what it says this Bill will let it do. Unfortunately the Government has not seen fit to use the Act and, consequently, would thrust this measure down our throats. Apparently court-controlled ballots will be conducted when any little industrial dispute arises in any small factory in the State. This will hold up the wheels of industry and will do nothing whatever to increase production or promote industrial peace. Apparently the Government's motive is to ensure that industrial peace, as it defines the term, and not industrial justice prevails—and there is a distinction between the two.

Most members of the Liberal Party who are working men are members of unions. They must be. The Government parties are disturbed that unionists are not voting in union elections. To make sure that they do

vote, they intend to crack the whip. According to the voting figures at general elections, at least 45 per cent of union members vote for the National Party or the Liberal Party. But they are not voting in union ballots! That is what is disturbing the Government parties. Through this legislation the Government intends to ensure that these people vote as they would like them to do in union ballots. The Government parties are ignoring the fact that they are not interested, that they do not trust the Government and are not concerned about what the Government wants in union ballots. It may be that they are satisfied, but the Government is trying to imply that the workers are not satisfied with the conduct of their unions. Union members need guidance and advice from their leaders. They have needed advice throughout the history of industrial relations. Many of them are not sufficiently concerned about the machinery of the union system and simply let it go along. But the Government is not satisfied. It does not want to think that union members are satisfied with their conditions and the way in which they were achieved.

The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission would be quite capable of dealing with industrial disputes and other industrial matters if it were allowed to carry out its duties and functions. But it is not strong enough. It does not play its proper part in industrial relations. In many cases it is not a court of arbitration, but a punitive court and often unions have to defend themselves in it. Its proper function is to arbitrate on the various points of view put before it, but quite frequently when unions approach the commission they find that it is loaded against them in the light of the attitude of the community, and of the Government, which influences the community. If the Industrial Commission were actively fair-minded, bent on achieving industrial peace, the provisions in our industrial law could well bring about peace in the industrial community.

The Minister, in his introductory speech, did not refer to any move to introduce court ballots on decisions made by the Chamber of Commerce or the employer federations. No move is being made to impose court ballots on any decision the employer groups may make on industrial action. They can use any provocation—even to intimidation of employees but there is to be no statutory check on how their decisions are reached on action to be taken on employees. There are more ruthless, vindictive and disruptive elements in the employer organisations than in the trade unions. These employer associations and organisations are deliberately provocative towards the unions. I believe that half of this country's industrial problems stem from their disruptive and provocative actions.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. MELLOY: The honourable member is wasting his time.

The Minister mentioned sweetheart agreements. I believe that they achieve quite a lot in industry. They are a step along the road to the ultimate goal of employer-employee management committees. I feel sure that sweetheart agreements in fact lead to more harmony within an industry and thus to more production. It is proper that the Industrial Commission should endorse them. They do not necessarily spread to every other section of an industry. If a union is able to arrive at a desirable sweetheart agreement with an employer, that is all to the good of the employees. After all, it is an acknowledgment by the employer that the conditions and wages sought by the employees are warranted. I repeat that it leads to industrial harmony and increased production.

I do not have much more to say at this stage. The Bill will be closely studied by those concerned with industrial relations in this State. I hope that the Minister will give the Opposition sufficient time to study the Bill properly—that he will give us at least three weeks before the second-reading stage. For years the Government has been straining at the leash to bring legislation of this nature into the Chamber. Now that it has introduced it, it should give industry and others in the community who are interested the opportunity to examine the clauses of the Bill carefully so that everybody will have ample time to assess the faults and merits of the legislation.

I do not think the Government is greatly concerned with a peaceful industrial climate. Legislation of the sort it is introducing today will in the long run lead to chaos within Australia. By the end of the century this country will be ruled by a dictatorship, either from the Right or the Left, if legislation such as this continues to be placed on the Statute Book. Australians are fed up with the way Parliaments are presently run. They have had a gulf of most political parties. If political parties continue to bring down legislation such as this, the citizens of this country will give our parliamentary system away. Apparently this Government is intent upon making its contribution towards bringing about that state of affairs.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (4.19 p.m.): In the past two or three hours we have witnessed an interesting exercise. After listening to the comments of members of the Opposition I have arrived at the very firm conclusion that they are attempting to have two bob each way. To my way of thinking this is rather courageous legislation. I realise that it carries with it an enormous number of implications; but as responsible members in this Parliament we have to make up our minds whether we are enthusiastic about providing a better system for those persons who are engaged in our work-force or whether in fact we will accept

the rules and regulations that presently exist. If the content of that statement is analysed it will be seen that most people who are engaged in industry today are very gravely concerned at the attitudes that are being developed by the trade unions.

Trade union officials pretend to be interested in the welfare and well-being of the persons who are engaged in industry. On the other hand, by their actions, they are doing everything humanly possible to destroy the interests and welfare of those people. In making that comment I refer specifically to the Hawkes, the Halfpennneys—the “Quarterpennneys”—the Carmichaels and the Bevises whose attitudes have done so much to destroy the interests of those persons who are engaged in industry.

We do have a number of problems that we must try to overcome. I realise that it will not be simple to conduct a secret ballot at a place of employment, but at least we have to give those persons who are being adversely affected by the present administration an opportunity to express an opinion and to give the Government of the day a clear-cut indication of whether or not they want the present circumstances corrected. There is the possibility—and I know the Minister is aware of it—that on some occasions, as a result of a secret ballot, members in the work-force will remain on strike. That is democratic.

It has been suggested by members of the Opposition that the purpose of the exercise of conducting a secret ballot is to bash the fellows within the unions. This has neither been suggested nor been requested. All that this legislation will do is permit the persons who are employed to indicate very clearly whether they want to continue a strike or go back to work. If they say or indicate they prefer remaining on strike to returning to work under present conditions, then we have a case to analyse and try to overcome the difficulties that exist.

I would be the first person to agree with members of the Opposition that unions today do have a vital role to perform; I recognise this; but we do request of them that they be rational in their approach and work in the best interests of the people whom they are elected to represent. This is not happening. Beyond a doubt they have convinced all people that their sole purpose and function in life is to destroy our present economic system. I have no illusions about that. If that happens, where do we provide employment for the people we are seeking to protect?

I beg your indulgence for a few minutes, Mr. Miller, to quote figures extracted from the annual and audited report of B.H.P. for 1975. It is one of the greatest and largest industries in Australia. It employs an enormous work force. Last year it employed 63,000 people and its salaries and wages bill to that staff was \$551,477,000, which

represents an increase of over 30 per cent in the past 12 months, as the figure for 1974 was \$378,878,000.

During that 12 months, the additional people employed numbered only 1,000. When those figures are analysed, they give a very clear indication that salaries and wages increased by 30 per cent.

During the past few months this company and other similar companies have been condemned on many occasions for their attitude to their employees. We all know the conditions under which people worked in industry in the dim, dark ages one, two and even three centuries ago. That situation had to be corrected—and it was. But rather than settle for reasonable conditions, many unionists, specifically those on union executives, have gone just as far the other way. The result is the economy of this country is being destroyed.

The biggest problem of this nation today is inflation. Who pays for it? That money comes from the pockets of those who constantly insist on higher salaries. I do not blame people in certain circumstances for seeking improved conditions—that is only natural—but they must be rational in their approaches. That is not happening today, and, unless the trend is altered, this country faces a very sorry future. As has been mentioned by other speakers, we can expect galloping inflation and increased unemployment. Surely there must therefore be some merit in any legislation that is intended to work in the interests of those we hope to protect, namely, those in the work-force of this State.

I have said before that a nation's only real asset is the applied skill of its work-force. If this is recognised, it will be seen that we must do something to protect those who, beyond doubt, create this asset. They are the ones with whom we are vitally concerned now.

I could say many more things, but I shall have the opportunity to expound my theories more fully at the second-reading stage after I have seen the contents of the Bill. In those circumstances, all I shall say now is that I commend the Minister on introducing this legislation. He will have many sticky patches to ride over, and he will have to endure considerable opposition from the executives of some unions, who will make it as difficult as they possibly can for him. But let us, both Government and Opposition members, be statesmanlike in our approach to the problem. What we have to do is attempt to improve conditions for the rank and file in the work-force—for every man, woman, boy and girl. We are aware that the legislation does not provide all possible avenues for improvement, but at least it does something to assist those who are now so vitally and adversely affected. Let us give it a go. As the Minister is confronted

with situations that will beyond doubt arise, I imagine it will be necessary to amend the legislation from time to time.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (4.29 p.m.): This infamous Bill was introduced at the behest of the real bosses of the Liberal Party, namely Mount Isa Mines Limited, the Retailers Association of Queensland and the Queensland Employers' Federation. I have never seen a more unwilling Minister introducing a Bill than the honourable Fred Campbell today. It is obvious he was the unwilling tool of the lunatic fringe of the Liberal Party. This union-bashing Bill has been introduced only to ensure tame-cat unionism in this State. Members of the Liberal Party want to turn the clock back and have every worker touch his forelock when he arrives at a job and when he leaves. This Bill has been introduced as a kick-back. The Liberal Party is paying off its big backers for the moneys they contributed to the campaign fund for the recent election.

One of the provisions in the Bill requires that a ballot be taken after a strike occurs. For the life of me I cannot see how this will ever be successful; it is like closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. The Minister also said that the commission will have the power, where a strike has occurred, to order a secret ballot to be taken provided 20 per cent of the employees concerned desire one. I ask the Minister: As the awards of industrial unions of employees are now subject to such stringent control by the Industrial Commission, will similar powers be introduced to control price and cost fluctuations of industrial unions of employers also registered with the Industrial Commission? I will be interested to hear the Minister's comments. The Minister said that strikes will be illegal if a ballot is not taken after the strike occurs. Once again, if 20 per cent of the members decide that this is—

Mr. Frawley: You've rigged a few ballots in your time.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I have never rigged any ballot. Every ballot I participated in was always fair and above board. One of the ludicrous remarks made by the Minister was that there was an unwillingness by employers to prosecute employees. If he believes that, I think he must be smoking opium. In all my experience as a union official I have not seen many employers who were averse to prosecuting decent, hard-working union members.

Mr. Lester: What was your position in the union before you entered Parliament?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: In answer to that intelligent interjection by the honourable member for Belyando, I was the State organiser of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union.

An Honourable Member: A good one, too.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That's right, the best. The Minister also said that the registrar will insert an advertisement in the newspaper instructing workers to return to work within a certain period or be sacked. I would like the Minister to explain what the "certain period" will be. I see the Minister is back.

Mr. Campbell: I've heard it all; there's nothing in what you've said.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Just listen again and you may be enlightened. I ask again: What happens in the case of a daily newspaper with some employees under Federal awards and others under State awards and all the unions involved are registered with the State Industrial Commission? Can the journalists working under a Federal award vote in a secret ballot concerning a strike affecting the printers covered by a State award? Likewise, what happens if the journalists under the Federal award take strike action preventing publication and affecting unionists employed under State awards? What about interference in the ballots? The Minister said there should be no picketing.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: True, I have been on picket lines before today. I hope this is binding on employers as well as employees. Surely we are not going to revert to industrial scabbery. When decent workers are striking for better wages and conditions nobody can tell me that anyone who breaks a picket line is not a scab of the lowest order who should be condemned by every decent member of this Committee. I think the Bill is like the curate's egg—good in parts.

The Minister also said that a notice of resignation from a union must be in writing and shall be given to the union, yet the Industrial Commission can order a person to be admitted as a member of an industrial union. Why the difference there? Surely the Government is not going to abrogate the terms of the award under which a union member has to give three months' notification of resignation in writing and be financial at the time of resignation. Is that going to be changed? The Minister says the Industrial Court can order a person to be admitted to an industrial union. In all my experience as an organiser I have never known any person employed under any union's list of callings to be refused admittance to that union.

Mr. Frawley: What about the honourable member for Windsor? He was thrown out!

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The only thing the honourable member for Windsor has in common with the honourable member for Murrumba is that in company they scabbed on the members of the Electrical Trades Union by repairing a lift in Parliament House. And they made a very patchy job of it.

Mr. MOORE: I rise to a point of order. I find the remarks of the honourable member offensive, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Windsor finds the honourable member's remarks offensive. I ask him to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Miller. I withdraw them.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. I, too, find his remarks offensive. What he said was refuted in this Chamber in a personal explanation I gave about the matter.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Murrumba also finds the honourable member's remarks offensive. Will he please withdraw them?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The point of order is the only other thing they have in common.

The Minister said that a new section is to be inserted in the Act to provide that a union official report his presence to the employer or his representative. I always thought that was the case. I have never known any union official to go onto a job without reporting first to the office to let the employer know, as a matter of courtesy, that he was on the job. I know from experience that as long as visits by a union official do not interfere with the continuity of work or do not coincide with busy periods or, in the case of the retail stores, with lunch hours, most employers have no objection to a union official being on the job.

If we took to the stage of stupidity enforcement of the industrial law that a union official shall interview members only during their lunch hour or morning and afternoon tea breaks, chaos would be caused in industry. On the other hand, the union official has the right to walk on the job and demand to see the employer's time and wages book. I could cite a number of establishments where, for some mysterious reason, the time and wages book is always missing when a union official tries to inspect it. The Minister should ensure that all employers keep their time and wages book on the premises at all times.

The Minister referred to the protection of workers' representatives. Quite a number of union officials have been assaulted, and no action has been taken by the Industrial Commission. Most cases of industrial assault are very hard to prove.

As to arrears of wages—it is very unanimous to increase from six months to 12 months the period for which arrears of wages can be claimed. The Minister said nothing about how much a magistrate is going to grant. It is only fundamental justice that, if through some fault of the employer an employee has been underpaid for two or

three years, that employee should be reimbursed completely. When I was a union official, a cleaner at Chandlers was underpaid \$1.50 a week. When I approached the personnel officer, Mr. Di-Bacchi, he said, "I know the award. Whether we have been underpaying her or not, she's only entitled to six months, and that is all she is going to get." That is what happened in one of the largest electrical firms in the State.

There should be far more visits by industrial inspectors to police industrial awards. Many awards are being breached, but none more so than by the rorts and rackets of beauty salons in Brisbane.

Mr. Campbell: What about 4KQ?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: 4KQ is a decent radio station. It always abides by the award provisions. The Minister knows that.

Mr. Campbell: Is that so?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The Minister knows so. Why doesn't he send his industrial inspectors to the beauty salons? That is where the award is being breached. Some junior females are not receiving a lunch hour. Others are going to lunch at 3.30 or 4.30 p.m. Under the Minister's administration of the industrial portfolio the industrial inspectors are toothless tigers. Why doesn't the Minister put some teeth in the Act by increasing the penalties for breaches of the awards?

An Opposition Member: What about the massage parlours?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The Minister may know something about massage parlours; I don't.

The Industrial Commission's powers are broadened in regard to what have been termed "sweetheart" agreements, with the obvious purpose of destroying collective bargaining. There is a section confining applications to the Industrial Commission for awards to the Minister, an industrial union or an employer. The provision is no doubt included in an attempt to promote the extinction of the United Firefighters' Union, which has been denied registration with the State Industrial Commission. That matter has been a running sore for a long time, but the Minister, to his discredit, has done nothing to settle the dispute between the U.F.U. and the Australian Workers' Union.

Mr. Marginson: He probably sent a telegram to Senator McClelland.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I am told he rings Senator McClelland every day for a briefing.

I am aware that industrial agreements must conform to industrial awards, and must be in writing between the trade union and the employer. Reference has been made to sweetheart agreements. Some industrial agreements that are registered with the Industrial

Commission are good agreements and certainly could not be described in those terms. The Minister is introducing this measure to abrogate those industrial agreements so that the big backers of the Liberal Party might be protected.

The Minister is bringing forward this measure hastily after notice of its introduction was given in the closing stages of last Thursday's debate by the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport. I will reserve further comment till the second-reading stage.

Mr. BYRNE (Belmont) (4.41 p.m.): The Bill as outlined by the Minister operates on three principles—responsibility, justice and democracy. Despite what members of the Opposition may say—or, indeed, may not say—the provisions in it will work to the benefit of the people of Queensland. The honourable member for Nudgee has warned us that from this Bill would come chaos in our society. He did not tell us how this would come about; he was content to make bland, ineffectual statements.

It is important for honourable members and the public to realise that trade-unionism has a history and a background which give us some insight into the best way of approaching legislation dealing with trade unions. In other words, of trade-unionism there is a definition and a purpose.

One definition, that of a Labor member of the British Parliament, Arthur Bottomley, in a book entitled "The Use and Abuse of Trade Unions", is as follows—

"A trade union is an association of workers which exists to protect their interests. Thus its rightful function is to maintain and improve the working conditions of its members."

He further states that "any alliances into which it may enter to increase its power and authority must remain subservient to the main purpose".

On another occasion and in another place Sir Winston Churchill said of trade unions—

"They are those institutions which lie so near the core of our social life and progress, and which have proved that stability and progress can be combined."

The Bill and the concept of trade-unionism deal with responsibility. There is a bounden responsibility on unions to the community, on union leaders to their members, and on individual unionists to their fellow unionists and also to their families. There is also a co-relative responsibility between employers and employees.

I was surprised at the comment of the honourable member for Bulimba that attributed to the unions the incapacity to survive if this legislation is implemented. He spoke of infighting. I point out to him that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

In implying that because trade unions may have their disagreements they will break down, the honourable member is imputing to trade unions ignoble motives.

Throughout the world there are many types of trade unions, but the fact remains that any union that allows issues before it to be judged other than from the standpoint of the wishes of the majority of its members is not a genuine trade union. That statement was made by a member of the Labor Party in the British Parliament, and it cannot be emphasised too strongly because it is the very essence and purpose of the legislation under debate today. For the sake of honourable members opposite, I shall repeat it—

“Any union which allows issues before it to be judged other than from the standpoint of the wishes of the majority of its members is not a genuine trade union.”

Indeed, any opposition to this Bill from honourable members opposite or the community can only be seen as opposition opposing democracy. The question that I must ask members of the Opposition who are apparently so opposed to this legislation, at least in principle, is: What is their basis of opposition? Can they oppose the concept which enables justice and a democratic, fair means to exist, and which can provide, if possible, a means to a solution of strike action?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Do they have secret votes in the seminary?

Mr. BYRNE: In relation to the basis of this speech, I think it is important, at least for the benefit of the honourable member for Archerfield, to reveal something of the background of the history and development of the trade union movement.

The nature of unionism in its foundation in Australia was a developing one based upon an inherent justice and the desire for active principles of equality and freedom. Up to the 1900's it could not really be said to have had a changing nature; forms, structures and particular objectives, yes; but the basic intent behind it, and its general objectives, were not the expression of diverse aberrations of sectional interests. Rather, within the confines of its basics, its nature matured by that same process of dialectics as Karl Marx had espoused for the maturity of society.

Basically, unionism was to develop through the conflict of the attempts by the unions to succeed in their demands and the rebuffs that were continually meted out by employers and Governments alike. Each antithetical position acted as a catalyst to the next step to development, from demand through strike to arbitration and political legislation. Not that any stop was dropped along the way; rather was it incorporated into the growing power and strength of the unions to help achieve justice and equality.

Prior to 1850, though trade-unionism was beginning to assume that character it was to possess in the latter half of the century, its chief purpose was the provision of “social insurance and social cohesion for the Australian worker”, something which today we must not forget. Unionism in the latter half of the century was a principled reality on the path of development.

The very foundation and structure of Australian colonial life intrinsically tied to its convict and labour problems, the conflict of class, based purely on plutocratic grounds and that thorough Imperialist-colonial ethos perpetrated and perpetuated by the early military and later exclusive land-owning, pastoral, merchant class, were no doubt the historical elements leading towards the outcry of the working class for justice—for some form of “Liberty, Equality and Fraternity”—those cries of the enlightenment which never really seemed more than nice-sounding but basically meaningless words on the tongues of Australian colonists in a society almost bereft of unborrowed culture and intellectual impetus. Yet above all, Australia was a place where men were willing to speak their mind and felt it a right if not a duty, and certainly not a privilege, to seek that equality which the foundation of a Utopia for the working man presumably was meant to incorporate.

Trade unionism presented itself in the guise of demands for better wages, better hours and better conditions, by particular labour groups coming together to express their demands collectively, then by the use of their collective weapon, the strike, later by an attempted system of arbitration, and ultimately politically, as legislative power seemed the only way in the long run to cement their demands into the legislative process. Finally it expressed its basic developing nature indirectly through its progressively increasing policy formation in the areas of economy, society, labour, morality, education and eventually politics itself. In these cases the development and expression of policies were generally restricted to the individual unions making the policy and little was forthcoming from them until there was a strong political base capable of assisting the implementation of those demands.

The two basic elements of the determined nature of unionism were an inherent justice and an active principle of equality—two principles that we cannot ignore today, and two principles which this Parliament in viewing this legislation must ensure exist within it. These elements emerge as being the dominant instigators of both trade unions themselves and their varied activities. The early trade societies and unions were formed, as R. N. Ebbels said, for the “discussion, agitation and removal of the numerous grave obstacles at present impeding and obstructing the progress and prosperity of the working classes”. It was from these same bases that the early unionists fought for better

and more just wages, hours and conditions, as well as for, at first, the restriction of Chinese labour and immigration, and, in later years, the restriction of non-union workers. The Chinese were condemned not only because they deprived the Australian worker of labour and the full profits of the goldfields but also because the racial prejudice of the times saw them as immoral, socially objectionable and an economic drain on the country. Fortunately such racial prejudices, along with many other concepts of inequality of the past, have left us.

Early unions like the Miners' Protection League realised the importance of unity to express their demands for the privileges, rights and benefits that they were entitled to as well as the necessity for a just and equal representation in Parliament. In the later unionism it was these very concepts which were to move to the fore—not suddenly to appear, but rather to move to the more active front as the earlier, more pressing demands for better wages, hours and conditions were being met.

On that same principle of unity, as on the later "United we stand, divided we fall" tenet, right through the latter half of the century was there that desire for amalgamation and federation of unions. If not seen as practical at the time, it was at least an expressed desire. On the path to unity and consolidation, the development of trade-unionism is a development thoroughly dependent upon the acquisition of power. As one union official stated it—

"We recognise that we have in our hands a power and we feel that it is our duty to let not only our own people but you and others know that this power, latent as it is in many cases and quite hidden from view, still exists and with proper precaution and care can be used when wanted."

Responsible statements; but, in the light of many situations we find today, irresponsibly used.

The larger and stronger they were, the more political representation they could muster and eventually the greater part they could play in political demands, the more they were able to fight successfully for their basic justice, equality and freedom. Thus there was that never-ending struggle for increased membership—at times the most fervent activity—increased membership not only within the confines of a basis of selectivity as it was in the early development but also incorporating the members of allied trades, semi-skilled and unskilled workers. Yet at times members were few and apathy the dominant feeling prevailing in the union, as the minutes of the Friendly Society of Iron Moulders in 1890 showed. Still, they weathered the years, expanded, fought, failed, succeeded and developed, urged on by those driving forces of unionism—equality, justice and freedom.

Early unionism, through its provision of medical, accident, superannuation and funeral benefits, its desire for a system of protection for Australian industry and a very tight and strictly controlled apprentice system ensuring that neither union worker nor apprentice would be disadvantaged, economically or educationally, showed its social and fraternal concern in the welfare of its members—the basic principle upon which this legislation must operate also. There was in this that natural elemental desire for justice and equality in the realms of social welfare to be played down by later unions but incorporated early into political social-welfare Labor policy.

The confrontation of employer and employee, manufacturer and unionist, and the stubborn expression of the two factions expressed respectively in the lock-out and the strike were hardly productive of amicable relationships or an improved situation. Equality and justice, in the theory of the unionists, called for a more equitable sharing of profits on a more broadly based equity of capital and labour, along with a more even distribution of national wealth and eventual social equality.

The failure of the strike, and the primitive justice of both the strike and the lock-out, led eventually to the desire for a system of conciliation and arbitration, where friction between the two groups could be diminished and understanding more easily arrived at; but, with the prejudice of the arbitrators and the Government resting on the side of the employers (a situation which does not exist today), equality and justice it seemed could only be obtained through the power of the legislative process. Demands were made for the replacement of the property tax with a land tax only, and this political directive along with many others came to be symptomatic of the new unionism. Indeed it is from these attitudes, policy determinants and varied structural changes that the nature of trade-unionism emerges as very definitely a developing one based upon ever-broadening desires for equality, justice and freedom especially in the economic and social sphere—even if at times inconsistency, as in the case of discrimination against Chinese and non-union members, expresses itself as an apparent inequality; for within the terms of practical unionism both emerge on the downward balance of sectional justice.

The distinction between "Old Unionism" and "New Unionism" is not one of nature but rather one of mature and necessary development. W. G. Spence expresses this view clearly in his replies to the Royal Commission Enquiries into the Nature of New Unionism, 1891, and in his General Secretary's Report to both the A.S.U. and the General Labour Union. He saw that the basic objectives of unionism had not altered; they still were "a protection of rights and privileges", but that in the realm of means to this end the unions were now taking

a practical active stand in politics. They were becoming more organised and more active; but their only definite aim was still "improving the conditions of the masses". The basic nature of unionism still rested in that never-ending search and struggle for equality and justice, even if the concentration on the two elements of better wages and hours were moving into the background to be replaced with a "political organisation of the masses" and a "thorough industrial co-operation". Further in terms of its inherent basic nature in the realms of those qualities of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, there was no elemental change. For it was to be with power gained by the entrance into politics that the worker could be truly free to live "voluntarily" under the law in a society rid of its "competitive, selfish, social welfare" with a democratic equality in lieu of it and a "mateship in all things" with the road paved for "the spread of brotherhood"—truant expression of idealism perhaps, but the intended nature and goals of the new trade-unionism, and an intrinsic and mature development from its earliest years of formation.

It appears clearly, then, on an analytic base that a very lucid and explicit nature of trade-unionism can be determined. What emerges is indeed a developing yet unchanging character and nature to trade-unionism. Emphasis, structures, organisation and particular objectives altered as the unions became more organised, at times even bureaucratic, in the hierarchy of their administration. Throughout the dialectic of change through opposition to new strength and ideals expressing themselves in more mature and effective means of representation, the elemental constants of the nature of trade-unionism express themselves clearly as an inherent desire for justice, equality and freedom specifically directed in the areas of social and economic welfare. By 1900 trade-unionism had matured as an effective force whose basic nature was to find eventual fulfilment in political voice and representation.

That situation of basic justice, equality and freedom as the essence and nature of trade-unionism has not altered, could not alter and must remain the basis upon which this Parliament accepts and introduces legislation. It is a question dealing with the responsibility of this Parliament. It is a question dealing with the responsibility of trade unions and also of trade union leaders. If these facts are avoided and forgotten, we fail to fulfil the necessary functions that this Parliament must perform in relation to industrial legislation.

The strength of the unions lies in their solidarity. Given responsible leadership, trade unions can and do wield enormous influence within the community, within the society, within industry and of course over Governments. The role of trade unions in a free society is not only to bargain with employers for more pay, shorter working

hours and better conditions; it is also to safeguard the security of employment and to strengthen the national economy by improving standards of workmanship and productivity.

In Queensland in these preceding years we saw situations, as statistics show, where working days lost in 1969-70 were 128,000, rising to 373,000 in 1972-73 and standing at 314,000 in 1973-74. There were losses of up to nearly \$6,000,000 in wages. And where are those losses really felt? Are they really felt by the working industries or are they felt more by the individual worker himself? Are they felt more by the subsidiary industries and their employees who find themselves out of work because of irresponsible action taken?

I do not say that all strikes are irresponsible, but no person in this Chamber can convince me that there are not strikes that are irresponsible and that there are not strikes that have unfortunate and irresponsible effects not only upon the workers themselves affected and upon their families but also upon every other section of the community affected by them.

This legislation endeavours, through a principle of responsibility, through a principle of justice and through a democratic structure to enable if possible some of these irresponsibilities to be overcome. If this Bill can achieve that much, it will have indeed achieved a great deal.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (5 p.m.): In general terms, the Bill expands the power of the State Industrial Commission and restricts the authority of trade unions. It is significant that it has been propelled into the Parliament in sudden haste today, in the midst of the A.C.T.U. Congress, whilst most Queensland trade union officials are absent in Melbourne.

Mr. Campbell: What utter rot!

Mr. BURNS: The Bill arises from the recommendations of an unofficial committee headed by the honourable member for Toowoong some time ago, whose report was considered by the Parliamentary Liberal and National Parties last year. The Bill could easily have been presented last year, and it could also have been presented this year. It could certainly have been introduced last week, when we were putting up with filibusters and wasting time because legislation was not ready for presentation. Yet we find, significantly I believe, that the legislation is presented for urgent debate whilst the A.C.T.U. Congress is deliberating vital national industrial questions in Melbourne.

Mr. Campbell: What utter rot!

Mr. BURNS: The Minister will have his opportunity to reply, and we will be able to reply to him on the second reading.

The timing is obviously designed to provide Government members with a forum for adventures in union-bashing and union-bullying whilst the attentions of the industrial leaders of this State are quite rightly diverted to areas of immense national importance at the A.C.T.U. Congress.

The provisions of the legislation affect 73 industrial unions of employees with a combined membership of 332,000, and 43 industrial unions of employers with a total membership of 41,000. It will be interesting to see whether the amendments brought down for deliberation today will be enforced on employers, as they are enforced on unions. Will the Government continue to find, as it always does, that every time there is an individual dispute the workers are to blame? There is never any blame apportioned to the other side. I think that this is the reasoning behind most Government legislation, and the reason why most of it fails. The Government simply does not understand the attitude of the average worker.

We are deliberating, in the Minister's words, amendments which to a degree are previously unknown in this State. They are amendments that will inhibit the traditional rights of trade unions to control their own domestic affairs. "Big Brother" is being introduced to Queensland unionism. The "Big Brother" attitude expressed in this Bill is similar to that experienced in totalitarian countries to which Government members constantly refer when they are waving the red flag. "Big Brother" is being introduced when the Government says in effect, "We will tell you how to conduct your affairs. We will control you."

Over many centuries statements on the rights of unionists to stand up for their principles have been made by many well-known and respected conservative men throughout the world. When I hear attacks made on the right of trade unionists to strike, I am reminded of this statement made by General Eisenhower at the American Federation of Labour Convention in 1952—

"The right of men to leave their jobs is a test of freedom. Hitler suppressed strikes. Stalin suppressed strikes. But each also suppressed freedom. There are some things worse than strikes—much worse than strikes—and one of them is the loss of freedom."

Whenever we try to suppress the worker who says, "Because I am concerned at the way I am being treated, I don't want to work today," we repress a little of the freedom for which we fought in this nation. I am sorry to say that that then becomes a form of political oppression. If the Government uses its might and its numbers to force through amendments to restrict the right of the individual to have his say and to run his own organisation, it adopts the exact stand taken in the past by Governments of countries that we have had to fight in past world wars.

If one looks at last year's report of the President of the Industrial Court, one can see that this legislation should not only affect the ordinary workers; it should affect hotel-keepers, the Chamber of Commerce, building firms, graziers, and others, for they are all unions covered by the Act. If restrictions are to be applied to the workers, I hope they will also be applied to the employers. I hope, too, that the provisions governing ballots and elections will also apply to them.

I believe that this legislation is the predictable by-product of a Government led by a Premier who was against the 40-hour week, and who opposed long service leave and workers' compensation. In fact, in a parliamentary career spanning 28 years our Premier has opposed almost every industrial concession sought and won by the Queensland people. He has been against the lot.

Mr. Moore: Prove it.

Mr. BURNS: His statements in "Hansard" prove it. Read "Hansard", my friend. Throughout his domination of what I believe is an insipid Government, this advocate of industrial hostility intrudes into our right to strike and challenges internal powers of trade unions. The Opposition believes that the right to withdraw labour is a treasured possession of Queensland employees. While honourable members opposite, including the honourable member for Toowong, assail this basic freedom of the Queensland citizen, they are in fact assailing democracy. Their version of democracy is, "It's all right to do what Mr. Porter wants you to do, but that is the only form of democracy or freedom you are allowed in Queensland."

Let me refer to points made by the Minister. I agree with his decision to repeal section 98 concerning secret ballots. I can remember being involved in the early years of the Calcap strikes. We used to have circulars sent out to us which contained Mr. Morris's famous statements that the provision of secret ballots would make certain that rank-and-file members of the unions would be able to control decision-making in relation to strikes for ever more. The Government promised an end to strikes in its 1961 legislation and it failed. I suggest that we should all study the instruction on the conduct of a ballot that was sent out in those days. For example, on the Calcap ballot papers, Case No. B109 of 1967, Commissioner R. H. Tait spelt out our rights to strike and then at the end of the judgment told us that the area affected was the Shire of Wangaratta within a radius of 10 miles from the Collinsville Post Office. Unionists in a number of unions (the Amalgamated Engineering Union; the Ironworkers Association; the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society; the F.E.D. & F.A.; the Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association; the Electrical Trades Union; the Bricklayers' Society; the Society of Carpenters and Joiners; the Plasterers' Union; the Plumbers and Gasfitters'

Union) working anywhere within 10 miles from Calcap were entitled to vote in the strike ballot.

Then we come to Swanbank, just a little closer to home. Case No. B122 of 1968 was handled by Commissioner G. W. Pont, who said in his decision—

“This Commission declares that the district affected shall be the local authority area of the city of Ipswich and the local authority area of the Shire of Moreton.”

Workers throughout all of that area were forced to vote to determine whether the workers at Swanbank were entitled to argue with their boss. And the Government wonders why this procedure does not work. Is it any wonder that the Minister today has to tell us that those sections of the Act were inoperative. If honourable members saw the rules laid down for the ballot and the type of ballot that was to be conducted, they would know why they did not work and why it was impossible for them to work. It makes one wonder how effective the new ballot provisions will be. How are we going to conduct our new ballots? Are we to go through the same sort of procedure? Is the registrar—

Mr. Moore: The ballot-box principle.

Mr. BURNS: It is the ballot-box principle then?

The Government is talking about justice and protection for someone who is being stood over on the job. The decision to bring him into some central spot to cast his vote might destroy the whole principle in which the Government is interested. If it wants to hold ballots (and I think they will be a waste of time), why not have the system whereby the ballot-paper is posted to the member's home and he can sit with his wife and argue about whether he should continue to strike. He can make a decision in his home.

The Government is also making provision for the police to be involved with the ballot. The Government is going to have a situation in a heated industrial dispute where the police will be standing around the ballot-box. That is part of what the Minister said this morning.

Mr. Campbell: No.

Mr. BURNS: The Minister said that the police can arrest without warrant anyone impeding the ballot. In other words, the police are going to be involved in the ballot. If they are, the Minister will not convince anyone who votes under the policeman's scrutiny that that is part of the democratic process.

Mr. Campbell: That's your argument, and a pretty weak one, too.

Mr. BURNS: I read the speech which the Minister so kindly made available to me during the luncheon adjournment.

Mr. Campbell interjected.

Mr. BURNS: The provisions for police action are there and, if the Minister desires me to do so, I shall quote his own words in relation to the police and he can take it from there. The Minister said—

“Attempts to intimidate, threaten or obstruct will likewise not be permitted and power will be conferred on all members of the Police Force to arrest without warrant any person committing certain offences with respect to the secret ballots.”

How are they going to do that if they are not there? If I am intimidating a man who is voting at a ballot-box, how are the police going to do anything if they are not there to stop me? If they are standing around the ballot-box to prevent that situation, their presence will create a “Big Brother” impression.

Mr. Campbell: Do you support intimidation?

Mr. BURNS: No; but that is the most intimidatory situation I could possibly imagine. The Minister is going to stand the police beside the ballot-box and say, “Here is democracy for you fellows; roll up and vote. The policeman is only there to see you get a fair go.” In all my experience I have never seen a man get a raw deal over a secret ballot. I have heard complaints but I have never yet seen in my union a valid objection to a secret ballot conducted by the union returning officer. Registrars and others have had an opportunity to scrutinise ballots conducted by my union, the Electrical Trades Union. We have been involved in ballots for a long while. Some have won and some have lost.

Mr. Campbell: Have you seen people walk through the picket line?

Mr. BURNS: To a secret ballot? These ballots are by post. The Minister is setting up the picket line because he is setting up the ballot-box. Ballot-boxes generally produce how-to-vote cards and canvassing. He is not suggesting that the ballot should be conducted by post; he is suggesting that there should be a ballot-box. That could bring the personal confrontation and arguments which can occur around the ballot-box area. It is the Minister's decision. Mark my words, there will come a day when the Minister will be upset about that decision.

It will be impossible to organise an effective ballot overnight. The Minister's decision is not to vote for a strike beforehand but to force the strikers to a ballot in the middle of the strike. That is an ineffective provision. The Minister is letting the commission off the hook. The commission's job should

be to get people around the table and make them talk. All the commission will do in future will be to order a strike ballot. A considerable amount of time will be wasted while a ballot is organised. There will be no process of conciliation while the ballot is being organised and conducted. There will be continued confrontation. I do not believe that the Minister understands the feelings of the worker on the job.

Mr. Campbell: I know better than you do.

Mr. BURNS: The Minister is an expert!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The Minister will have an opportunity to answer the charges of the Leader of the Opposition at a later time.

Mr. BURNS: The Bill introduced by the Minister's predecessor, on the advice of the Government's experts, was so successful that here we are 14 years later admitting that it was wrong and inoperative! Even the A.C.T.U. decision on penal clauses made sections of it inoperative because the unions just would not take any notice of them. The Minister admitted that in his speech this morning. Now he is asserting that on the same advice—the Minister has become an expert; he knows all—he has provided the answers. I suggest to the Minister that we will soon be back amending his Bill. The unions will react to it in the same way as they reacted to the first provisions about strike ballots.

There are a number of questions we ought to ask about the conduct of ballots. What will happen if, after a successful secret ballot by either all or some of the workers in an industry, a group that has voted against a return refuses to return to work? Is the Minister going to sack them and deny them their long service leave and other conditions? Does this Government intend that they should lose those things when their services are terminated?

Mr. Campbell: That is their decision.

Mr. BURNS: When the Minister refers to termination of their work, is it his decision that they should lose all their previous privileges?

Mr. Campbell: That is their decision.

Mr. BURNS: In other words, that is what the Minister means. What will be the next step under the legislation? What if the workers boycott the ballot and do not turn up? What if a ballot is organised in a particular camp and no one turns up? What does the Minister do then? With provision for separate ballots for individual unions, what will happen if one declares for resumption and another for continuation of the strike? Again, what will happen? The Minister is introducing the Bill and he is going to have to implement it. Surely we are entitled to ask for an explanation of how it will work.

What will be the procedure in a State-wide stoppage that could include more than one union? From the Minister's comments this morning it appears to me that the emphasis is on strikes in workshops. How would it work with a Brisbane-wide or State-wide stoppage? I think that is a fair question. How will the Bill be implemented? Will voting booths be erected throughout the length and breadth of Queensland or will the ballot be conducted by mail? If a State-wide ballot is to be conducted, is the Minister going to have booths in every provincial city? The Minister is the one who referred to ballot-boxes.

An equally vague provision deals with wide powers of arrest for picketing and other activities. How is that going to be gauged? Unionists are scattered right throughout the State in all sorts of callings. The Minister is talking about ballot-boxes and voting and the powers of police to arrest people without warrant. It will be a major operation to conduct such a ballot. We could have the spectacle of ballot-boxes surrounded by policemen throughout the State. There is a great deal in the Minister's speech that needs questioning and the Minister should give the answers.

The Minister talked about resignations. At this stage I support the provision covering resignations, but I am a little concerned that it might be used by people who decide to leave one union and join another because the second union is cheaper. They have to be in a union so they join the cheaper one. They will use the resignation provision. If the Minister likes to read rule 45 of my union, the Electrical Trades Union, he will see that clear provision is made to cover resignations. We accept that a member should hand his resignation to the local secretary or tender his resignation in writing. A member who tenders his resignation is issued with a receipt. We cannot accept that simply because a man says he tendered his resignation by post he in fact did so.

Certain members have claimed that they have resigned by writing to the secretary and, when asked the name and address of the person to whom they submitted their resignation, were not able to supply the necessary details. For example, they did not even know where the E.T.U. office is situated. If a man had written, surely he would be able to say to whom he wrote. It is obvious that certain persons do not tell the truth, and these matters should be covered by the Bill or the regulations.

This Bill will allow the court to decide who shall be a member of a union. It shall also determine whether or not Mr. "A" should be accepted as a member of a union and on what grounds he should be accepted. If a man resigns from our union and, after 12 months, wants to rejoin it, we may not want him back, especially if he left the union to join one having lower union fees. This

occurs a lot in the railways, where employees move backwards and forwards from union to union. Would we be placed in the position of having to accept such a man if he decided to rejoin our union?

Mr. Campbell: What about when a union railroads a member out of it?

Mr. BURNS: A man must be given a right of appeal. There must be a system of justice, but justice cuts two ways. Responsible officers or members of a union are entitled to justice. They must be able to draw up their own rules and to operate their union as they see fit. I am sure the Minister's officers could point, as I can, to those workers who fit from union to union in order to gain the benefit of lower union dues.

Earlier in the debate reference was made to the large number of unions in the railways. Many of the smaller railway unions were supported by people who decided they wanted to be trade-unionists on the cheap. When the fee charged by one union was £10, another union charged a fee of £4, with the result that when things got tough some workers left the £10 union to join the £4 union, and when the £10 union became somewhat militant and gained certain advantages for its members some of those people in the £4 union left it to join the £10 union. Quite a lot of that went on among members in the railways.

Mr. Moore: Are you talking about the maintenance union now?

Mr. BURNS: I don't want to mention the name of any particular union. In the unions there are a great number of good people who joined for many excellent reasons. It is only a small percentage that used some unions shabbily.

Mr. Moore: Now you're talking about the maintenance union.

Mr. BURNS: I am not. The honourable member can name the unions if he wishes. I am talking generally of people who misuse trade-unionism in this manner.

The Minister referred also to the right of entry. An important thing to remember is that generally the employer who complains about a union official coming onto his job is the one referred to by the honourable member for Archerfield, the man who does not want his time and wages book examined. I ask the Minister on how many occasions action has been taken by his department against an employer for acting contrary to sections 126 and 127 of the Act. Section 127 refers to the posting up of an award and section 126 to wages books. I doubt whether many prosecutions have been lodged against employers for a breach of those sections, and I am sure that if a greater number of industrial inspectors were employed moving around among employers, there would not be any great complaint about union officials entering job sites. The man who whinges

about the union official is usually the one who has not paid his employees the money to which they are entitled.

I agree with the honourable member for Archerfield and with those Government members who interjected during his speech with reference to unpaid earnings. I cannot understand why a man who has deliberately underpaid a worker for a lengthy period should be required to make up the difference only for 12 months. I congratulate the Minister on extending the period from six to 12 months. Nevertheless I am sorry that he did not remove the limitation altogether. If an employer underpays a worker for three or four years, why should he be required to make up the difference of, say, \$1 or \$2 a week only for 12 months? Why should we legislate to let such an employer keep money earned by his employee?

Mr. Aikens: What about the fellow who is forced to buy three or four full union tickets a year?

Mr. BURNS: I take the honourable member's point as I agreed with some of his comments on demarcation disputes. Government members have become scared of trade-unionism; they are frightened that if, for example, all the railway unions amalgamated, there would be one huge union that would be able to hold the country to ransom. In my view a single large railway union would probably have one strike each year and would thereby save the country and its members a lot of money and strife. It would obviate many internal problems. Because of the fear that unions will grow very big and gobble up the whole country, we stop amalgamations. We then have inter-union fights and strikes.

(Time expired.)

Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (5.21 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to support this Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I believe this to be one of the Government's major Bills. As a person who has held an A.W.U. ticket and worked both on the shop floor in Brisbane and out in the shearing sheds in Western Queensland, I believe I have a little experience although probably not as much as some honourable members opposite. Nevertheless, I have had some experience of trade-unionism, so honourable members opposite cannot accuse me of not knowing what I am talking about.

The Bill goes a long way towards ensuring that individuals have their say on whether they wish to work or not. Section 98 of the Act declares strikes and lock-outs unlawful unless a secret ballot is held beforehand. This obviously is impracticable. Unfortunately the penal provisions have been ignored. Let us be practical about it and realise that there will always be strikes. Under the new provisions, a compulsory conference will be called.

I refute what the honourable member for Lytton said, namely, that we would only be calling for an immediate secret ballot. That is incorrect. Provision is there first for conciliation. If that is not successful, there will then be a secret ballot. Let us not get those points confused.

There are three ways in which this can be handled. The commission can call for a secret ballot. Twenty per cent of the rank and file of unionists can call for a secret ballot.

Mr. Houston: Of those who are on strike.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, of those who are on strike.

Thirdly, an industrial union can also call for a ballot. The implications are quite wide and very fair. We have all seen an instance of how one union, with maybe only 12 members involved, can go out on strike and create unemployment for 2,000 or 3,000 people.

Mr. Aikens: They can paralyse industry.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, they can do that completely.

That is not a good set-up. The Bill makes provision for the calling of a compulsory secret ballot of the union on strike. I hope Opposition members do not suggest there should be a ballot of the whole of the work-force that is involved in one way or another simply because the Transport Workers' Union goes on strike.

The principle of the provision is sound in that it puts the onus where it should be—on the individual. Should a secret ballot be called and the members vote for a continuation of work, the onus again goes right back onto the individual. Seven clear days after this matter has been advertised in the Press, anyone who does not go back to work automatically forfeits his employment. That puts the onus on the person who has freedom of choice. He does not have to go back if he does not want to. He may say, "I believe this to be so important that I will not go back." That is his right, and I do not argue with that.

Mr. Houston: Who will fill the vacant jobs?

Mr. Campbell: What, with 5 per cent unemployment!

Mr. Houston: So that is what you want to use for the strike-breakers. You want to use the unemployed!

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Bill contains many other measures that I consider to be beneficial. I will go through them briefly. I believe that most areas have been covered particularly well.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! I will not allow cross-fire while a member is on his feet.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Bill is designed as well to stop people intimidating others. It will extend the protection for union officers to include safety representatives. It will endorse equal pay for equal work, which was agreed on at the I.L.O. conference. The Bill will liberalise long service leave by excluding public holidays—I hope Opposition members will not oppose that amendment—and it will extend the period for which arrears of wages or under-payments can be recovered from six months under the existing Act to 12 months under this Bill. For unions trying to recover arrears of union dues from their members, the Bill limits the period to two years. I believe that is very important. We have seen many examples of the difficulties experienced by unionists as a result of union attempts to collect fees going back over a number of years.

The Bill will ensure that all agreements between unions and management will be filed with the Industrial Registrar. That provision will cover what have been termed sweetheart agreements. If the agreements are reasonable, they will be ratified immediately without any problem. However, those considered to be unreasonable will be the subject of arbitration. That amendment will avoid any leap-frogging effect by which one sweetheart agreement could push up costs in other areas. That is most important.

This legislation will confer on the Industrial Commission the power to declare whether a person is entitled to admission to an industrial union. That is necessary because of an instance in Toowoomba when an Electrical Trade Union member was coerced because he would not take part in an illegal strike. I believe this upholds a fundamental principle that we must adhere to.

I congratulate the Minister for having the courage to bring forward the legislation. Therefore, I commend his motion to the Committee.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (5.27 p.m.): In taking part in this debate, I wish to congratulate members of the Opposition for their very fine presentations in this important debate. I agree most whole-heartedly with speakers such as the honourable member for Rockhampton North, who led the debate on behalf of the Opposition, and the honourable member for Archerfield, who made a very erudite submission, particularly when he referred to the legislation as an attempt by the Government to endorse tame-cat unionism in this State.

He quite correctly and very justifiably referred to the legislation as having its origin in the minds of Liberal Party bosses who, through slush funds, have been able to

exert influence through putting several members into this Parliament. Unfortunately, for a long time, through the implementation of a nefarious agreement with members of the Liberal Party, the Government has been able to bring before this Assembly legislation which could be very detrimental to the working class of this State, at the same time greatly damaging its future.

Unfortunately for the Government, however, the Australian Labor Party has never denied its affiliation with the trade union movement. Many years ago the union movement was responsible for the very foundation of our political party—in the days when the workers suffered such oppression that they decided to band together and seek political representation, as opposed to the only other course open to them, namely, the overthrow of constitutional government by force—something that is in the Marxist philosophy, but certainly not in the philosophy of the Australian Labor Party.

Naturally, this will get under the skins of Government members, but at the same time we are pursuing a course which has been clear to the people of this State not only during our time in Opposition but also during our very long term as the Government in Queensland.

The Minister would have done much better if he had come up with something positive to remedy the unfortunate plight caused by refusal to upgrade the Workers' Accommodation Act. For years this matter has been looked at by many unions, including the F.E.D. & F.A. and the A.W.U., who have tried to obtain some form of justice—and the honourable member for Belmont spoke of justice—for the workers who go onto many of the jobs under the control of the State Government itself. If the Minister could come up with some positive improvement to that Act, that would be helpful and beneficial to these workers and would go a long way towards preserving industrial peace in Queensland.

The honourable member for Belmont spoke of justice and democracy. After all, in union and industrial affairs what is of paramount importance to the working people is that very sensitive part of the human anatomy, the hip-pocket nerve. The very vexed question of wage justice is always with us. Unfortunately, wages are fixed only after much litigation and detailed examination.

But what do we find on the other side of the scales? Prices are faring much better. In the main they are fixed without reference to any court. Fortunately for the country, the Prices Justification Tribunal was created not so long ago to provide some form of justice in these matters. However, the boards of directors of large companies, consortiums and monopolistic institutions in this country were able to fix their own prices until the advent of the Prices Justification Tribunal.

Take, for instance, B.H.P.—Australia's largest business concern. It could obtain its objective by a new share issue or simply a determination of its board of directors. It did not have to refer to any court. It did not have to go through a detailed examination in presenting a case in court as the union advocates have to do. However, the decisions of its board of directors affect the cost of hospitals, schools, refrigerators and many other essential services and commodities. It has a very strong influence on the economy of our State.

Were the workers represented at any time when determinations were made by the board of directors of companies like B.H.P.? Have they been able to make a direct approach to the companies? Certainly not! Are they able to confer with company accountants or directors? At no stage have they been able to do so. But seemingly the companies, by directors' decisions, have been able to justify determinations that have had a very harsh effect on the pay packets of all working people.

Sellers enjoy the benefit of free-enterprise monopoly, yet organised labour has its services regulated by courts; it has to appear before the courts practically every single time there is an increase in wages. Everybody else who can be affected by the court's decision has a right to appear in opposition to the applications that are made or to appeal against increases determined by the industrial tribunal.

But can anyone appear before a board of directors? If a person went to some of these institutions and sought to put a case before them, he would, I say colloquially, be pinched or given in charge to the police. There is no quarrel at all within the union movement about going to court as long as its appearance is not unilateral. It is only right for it to adopt this attitude.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. May I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that only one A.L.P. Opposition member is listening to the honourable member for Port Curtis? That is how interested they are in his speech.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis will continue his speech.

Mr. HANSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Miller. Facetiousness, I fully realise, will never be tolerated under your chairmanship.

The Minister said this morning that by means of ballots the workers will be able to determine for themselves whether strikes are to continue. He referred, of course, to sections 98 and 99 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. We all know that they have been a farce despite the statements made in this Chamber many years ago that they would lead to an era of industrial harmony and peace. They failed to do so.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, those statements made years ago were endorsed by the Minister who is now bringing down the Bill.

The Minister further said that the ballots will be of all employees at the places where strikes have occurred. Let us be realistic. Mr. Justice Hanger said, in his judgment handed down in the 1966 case, that the Industrial Court could not order compulsory unionism. What will be the position, for instance, in a mixed shop? Does the Minister think that in a strike ballot in a shop in which both unionists and non-unionists are employed, the union members will tolerate voting by non-union members? If the Minister thinks that they will, he is very gullible indeed. I say that this provision will merely further inflame the industrial situation. It certainly will not lead to industrial peace; on the contrary, it will in fact cause considerable confrontation. I merely throw that point in for consideration. Many others have been thrown in by Opposition members, and I hope the Minister will have satisfactory answers to them.

The provision for ballots for the election of union officials is nothing more than a palliative that has been included for the benefit of Liberal Party supporters. Most ballots for union office are now court controlled. Here I refer to unions such as the Miscellaneous Workers' Union, the Australian Workers' Union, the Waterside Workers' Union and the Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union. The Federated Clerks' Union, which has a large membership, has just completed a ballot which was conducted by the Federal agency. As the Minister well knows in his capacity as Minister for Labour Relations, the Federal Act supersedes the State Act in these matters.

What do we find in the application of this measure? It will apply to the Public Service, teachers, railwaymen, and a few other bodies of workers, but not to the great mass of union members. Let us therefore not get the idea that the Minister is doing something of great importance. He is merely including this provision as a palliative to enable him to say that he is the big strong man who will run around kicking all the union blokes fair in the backside.

He also said that Queensland will be unique in its provisions for long service leave, and that it is introducing something that has not been thought of in the rest of Australia. He was referring, of course, to the exclusion of statutory holidays from periods of long service leave. He contends that this makes Queensland the leader in the field. I remind him that, whereas in this State long service leave is a period of three months after 15 years, in South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania, long service leave is granted after 10 years. Those are therefore three States with long service leave provisions superior to those of Queensland. In New South Wales,

under the Metalliferous Award, the period for entitlement to long service leave is also 10 years. While the provision in the Bill is certainly desirable and I am not knocking it, I want to make it clear that the Government is not doing anything very radical in the proposed improvement in the long service leave provisions.

It was with sincere regret that I heard the honourable member for Toowong speak this morning about rather rude, bluff union officials calling at plants and acting in standover fashion in demanding right of entry. I have spoken to many union people and a considerable number of employers about this matter and on very, very few occasions have I been informed of discourtesy displayed by union officials. In the heat of an industrial confrontation there might have been some gruffness or discourtesy on the part of a union official but, by jove, there has been plenty from the other side of the fence, too. I do not think that honourable members could claim that even the most militant of union representatives or officials have ever been guilty of gross discourtesy in their dealings with management or their own union members. Generally, union officials have a very onerous task to perform and often they have to cope with side issues and unfounded criticism by a considerable number of people. But in the main I do not think they are grossly discourteous and it ill behoves the honourable member for Toowong to speak in this fashion. Possibly he was trying to justify his case, because, after all, I believe one of the crucial issues in this debate—although the honourable member made little reference to it—is that this Bill is a forerunner of things to come.

In Biblical times before the birth of Christ people spoke of the great Messiah who was to come. Likewise, in the months ahead there will be legislation conceived in the mind of the honourable member for Toowong and in the boardrooms of the Liberal Party bosses which will be even more detrimental to the working class than the legislation the Minister has introduced today. I suspect the use to which many of the provisions of the Bill will be put. I sincerely hope that my suspicions will not be realised; some of these provisions could lead to further confrontation which would affect the development of this fine State of ours.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (5.44 p.m.): During this debate there has been a lot of talk about unionism, the right to strike and the provisions contained in the Bill designed to end a strike. I am afraid strikes will always be with us; we will never be able to legislate against them. I believe that on two occasions in the past, similar legislation has been introduced to "do away with strikes". This was a misconception, probably due to a misunderstanding of human nature. Most strikes are not the result of a deliberate plan. An issue arises and, before

common sense can take over and debate allowed, a decision is made by a few hot-heads to go on strike.

The Minister referred to the provisions of section 98 of the Act. I think this was an ill-conceived section, probably because the legislators had not looked at the problem in depth and realised that it was an emotional one.

A most important part of the Bill is the provision for a secret ballot after a strike has been declared if it is called for by not fewer than 20 percent of the union involved. I would like the Minister to clarify the period before which not fewer than 20 per cent of the work-force can call for a secret ballot.

Originally the trade unions were formed to benefit the worker. It would appear that these days the trade unions do not benefit the worker and, as a rule, they do not benefit the public. Rather they seem to be the playthings or toys of a few militant, Marxist, international Communists with the result that 40 per cent of the present unions are controlled by dedicated, well-known Communists. They have given unionism such a black name in Australia that the movement has come in for a lot of criticism that it should not have received. That criticism is the direct result of the dirty leadership of unions and their inability to clean up their own back gardens and to organise themselves. Unionism has deteriorated greatly in this country in the last two years. Since the A.L.P. took office in Canberra we have seen a great spate of industrial strikes. Over that period the newspapers have reported on numerous strikes. Huge strikes in New South Wales completely disrupted the building industry with resulting soaring costs on construction jobs and large-scale unemployment. The same thing occurred in Queensland. The Leyland works closed down. The union organisers decided that they would get the Commonwealth Government to come in with them. With Japanese finance it was proposed that the Commonwealth Government take over the Leyland works and manufacture cars. That shows what little understanding of business principles the union organisers have. They led the workers and the Federal Government up the garden path. This country could not have stood another car-manufacturing plant. Luckily that scheme did not eventuate.

Recently we had a lot of strife in the Greenvale-Yabulu area. On 1 June 1974 "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" reported on the Greenvale dispute which spread to Yabulu. At that time Mr. Hutton of the Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union said that he was expecting further developments at the week-end but that the strike could spread in another fortnight. That is one instance where section 98 could have been used. It was a deliberately planned strike.

There was plenty of time to sit down and negotiate a wage increase. There was no urgency about that matter at all. A secret ballot could have been conducted and had the men decided not to strike, no-one would have been out of work. After the strike a considerable number of men left the North, including boilermakers and electricians. The work-force was depleted because many of the employees had had that type of procedure. With the proposed amendment to the Act, that type of thing should not take place in the future.

The Bill covers equal pay for women for equal work. That principle already obtains in many industries. In the professional field, years ago a woman doctor working in a Queensland hospital would have been paid less than a male doctor even though she was doing exactly the same kind of work. That has altered, and the whole principle should flow into other industries. In some industries a woman cannot do the same work as a man, irrespective of what has been said recently by the women's liberation movement in Australia. The proposed legislation refers to work that may not be of the same volume but of equal value, and I think that is an extremely fair way of looking at the female work-force. The words used are, "or performing work of like nature or of equal value". Such an approach is a very fair one.

The provision that allows an employee to be paid wages that he should have been paid but has not received—money "stolen" from him—is an extremely fair one. But I must admit that I cannot see why the statutory period should be only 12 months. If an employer is miserable and cunning enough not to pay his employees a flow-on from an award variation, or not to pay them their full award wage, he should be punished by being required to make up all the money owing to his employees, plus interest. The period prescribed should not be limited.

Members of the Opposition seem to think that those of us on the Government benches have displayed a very poor attitude towards trade-unionism. I suggest that Opposition members have been misled, because the majority of Government members consider trade-unionism to be absolutely essential. I feel all of us subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, from which I should like to quote certain extracts.

Article 20 lays down—

"(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

"(2) No-one may be compelled to belong to an association."

Later, Article 23 proclaims—

"(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

"(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

"(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

"(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests."

It is on the final paragraph that I join issue with the Leader of the Opposition, who criticised the creation of a large number of craft unions in the railways. Those smaller unions were formed for their own protection and for the protection of their interests. The maintenance union in Townsville has stood out strongly against amalgamation with larger unions because its members consider that they have a good deal to contribute in their trade.

Trade unions were established originally to protect workers and their industry, but unfortunately they are now nothing more than the toy of Marxist socialists and the toy of the Labor Party, which benefits a good deal from the imposition of a compulsory levy on unionists' subscriptions. If Government members were as bad as was alleged by the Opposition, we would be doing the same thing. No free-thinking, free-enterprise group of people would tolerate or even contemplate such skulduggery.

The Minister is to be congratulated on his introduction of this very fine piece of legislation, which no doubt will suffer from teething problems. It certainly will not provide the complete solution to industrial problems, nor will it be free from modification as people and situations change. Nevertheless it is a start, and I commend it to the Committee.

Mr. POWELL (Isis) (5.55 p.m.): Before speaking to a Bill such as this it is normal to give one's qualifications. I should like the two Opposition members who are bothering to sit in the Chamber to listen to the debate to know that, for 19 years, I have been a member of a union, and that I have held the positions of secretary, treasurer, president and State council representative of that union. I am still a member of that union. I therefore refute the rubbish spoken by Opposition members about honourable members on this side of the Chamber. It is quite obvious that Government members know quite a deal about unions. Indeed, most of us are, or have been, members of unions. We have been active members of unions interested in democracy.

I congratulate the Minister on his introduction of this legislation. The statements by the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members about the manner in which the Minister introduced it were ridiculous. It is quite obvious that they have

little argument to present against the Bill, and therefore made personal attacks on the Minister.

The Bill is designed to bring the Queensland industrial legislation up to date. With respect to the repeal of the penal provisions under section 98, at the moment no strike can be regarded as lawful unless it is authorised by a ballot of all the members of the union. Honourable members know that that procedure is totally unworkable. The Government, in its wisdom has decided to replace the provision with one that will be workable. In future, when workers decide to go on strike—and I hope it will be the workers who decide and not some agitators from outside—the commission, either of its own volition or after it has been approached by the union as a whole or some members of the union, will exercise its prerogative of submitting to a ballot the question of whether the strike should continue. What could be more democratic than that?

This afternoon we have heard a great deal about democracy, and the contention that this Bill is not democratic. Surely it is democratic if we get the people concerned to vote on a certain topic. That is exactly what this legislation is designed to do. The present position is unsatisfactory. We are therefore introducing a new idea which, I believe, will be welcomed by the workers of the State. Unfortunately we cannot legislate to cover all unions in Queensland, as some of them are controlled federally. Unlike the Federal Government we will not try to demand jurisdiction over that which is not ours. The idea of having a ballot that can be called by the court or by individual unionists is a very real step in the right direction.

If this provision is invoked with the best of intentions, as it should be, it should shorten strikes and give the workers an opportunity to speak—and speak loudly. We are talking about a secret ballot, not about a large room where a meeting of all workers is held, where they can be stirred up by agitators and where others are able to see how they vote. The idea is to hold a secret ballot and surely that is what we want.

I fail to understand why Opposition members cannot agree that this is a step in the right direction. Surely they, too, want industrial peace within our nation. Surely they too, want to see the worker, the ordinary man in the street—the fellow who lives largely from pay day to pay day—have justice done by him. In the light of the actions of agitators and highly paid union officials, it is quite plain that at the moment justice is not being done by him.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. POWELL: Before the dinner recess, after mentioning my credentials and the reason why I believe I am fully qualified to speak on this matter, I was explaining why I felt that the provisions for court-controlled ballots in the legislation before

us were far more democratic than the systems that have been used so far. I mentioned the present situation when a union involved in a strike calls mass meetings to decide whether it should be continued or not. Powerful union agitators attend the meetings to watch the way the vote proceeds. They carefully write down in their little black books the names of the people who vote against the strike and against their wishes.

This legislation will prevent that sort of nonsense, for the simple reason that the ballot will be court controlled. It may be conducted at the request of 20 per cent of the members of the union, at the request of the union or on the motion of the court. I believe that that is a step in the right direction. The step we are now taking will obviously regularise the conduct of strikes. Let it be understood that I for one have always recognised the right to strike, but only as a last resort. Unfortunately there are those in our community—especially in some of the larger unions—who decide that it is not the last resort but rather the first step that should be taken.

The provision for court ballots does not in any way preclude conciliation under the Act. On tonight's A.B.C. television news we witnessed the normal misrepresentation by members of the A.L.P. and some union leaders, who seem to think that this legislation will preclude unionists and employees from getting together and talking about matters in dispute. It is quite obvious, therefore, that those people do not know what they are talking about, which is fairly usual.

Section 99 is to be amended to make sure there is no interference with the court ballot when it is conducted. That surely is a sensible move.

The provision in the Bill for resignation of members from a union is, I feel, very sensible. Notice of resignation should be in writing so the union concerned knows whether the person wants to resign or not.

That brings me to the age-old issue of compulsory unionism. As a unionist, I believe that every worker should be a member of a union. I do not believe that people in any calling should accept the benefits that a union has obtained for them without being members of that union. However, I disagree that a person should be forced to become a member of a union. I do not see why we should be forcing people to join. If the union is gaining benefits for its members, it is obvious that they will want to remain as members. I finally agree that people should be members of a union.

Mr. Wright: Are you against the Queensland Teachers Union?

Mr. POWELL: I would not dare attack the Queensland Teachers Union, as I am still a member of it.

The provision relating to the election of union officials and the addition to section 86A of the Act, which deals with the way in which union officials are elected, is a worth-while amendment and one that would be applauded by all members. It never ceases to amaze me how in some instances democracy is not practised in certain places. The union of which I have had very late experience has always insisted that the forms of democracy, as we know them today, should at all times be adhered to. But that is not so in some unions, and in their disputes and the election of officers we invariably see sly tactics. The court is to be the arbiter in all of these instances.

I have sat through the debate today in silence because I believe that people who wish to express their opinions should be given the right to do so in a reasonable manner. The loutish behaviour of those honourable members who yell out all the time detracts completely from the standard of debate.

I should like now to refute some of the statements made by various members of the Opposition, especially the honourable member for Bulimba, who spoke about fees paid by unions to the A.L.P. The point is that the A.L.P. accepts the money from those unions whether the unionists like it or not. I do not think that that is a very democratic way to carry on the business of a union or any other organisation.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Tell us about the compulsory levy you put on the sugar growers.

Mr. POWELL: The honourable member for Archerfield has had his say and I suggest that he wait until he has had another turn.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I am only trying to help you.

Mr. POWELL: That would be quite impossible.

The honourable member for Bulimba also referred to ruling and governing. Obviously he does not know the meaning of those words, so I suggest that he look at a dictionary. This Government has governed and it has governed wisely and well. That is obvious judging by the number of A.L.P. Opposition members.

The Leader of the Opposition said that this was an insipid Government. If he believes that the Government is insipid he obviously believes that the people, too, are insipid for voting the Government into power. The people of Queensland are probably well aware of what the Leader of the Opposition thinks of them. It is strange that, every time the Australian Labor Party is defeated at the polls, its supporters say the people are stupid and that, whenever that party wins, they say the people are very wise. I wonder at the rationale and the logic of Labor members in these particular matters.

In the newscast, the Leader of the Opposition said that the legislation was being introduced with undue haste, yet when he spoke

in this Chamber he said that after 14 years it was high time some sort of change was made. Again, as we often do, we find a contradiction in his views. The point is that the Government introduced the original legislation and worked with it as best it could. All unions are not as bad as some of the Left-wing unions, but some of the unions have flouted the law and in its wisdom the Government intends to change the law to make it workable.

The Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members said that we in Government do not know where we are going. The point is that we are flexible. We can see the change in the electorate and therefore we are prepared not only to change with them but also for them. Times have changed; we are flexible; and we are introducing legislation that will be for the benefit of the worker. I admit that the legislation will probably not be to the benefit of the power-seeking union leaders, but they are not the people we wish to look after. The people we want to look after are the everyday workers, the men in the street, the fellows who are working hard to make this country prosper. Those who are working hard to make this country function are not given a chance to have their say. When there is a strike, they get no pay, although union leaders continue to receive their wages. As a matter of fact, it has been reported to me that some of them receive double pay during a strike.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That's silly, and you know it.

Mr. POWELL: I hope that that is incorrect.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You were a school-teacher. You should have more sense than that.

Mr. POWELL: Friends of mine who work in some unions have told me that that is so. I hope it is wrong. However, the fact remains that whilst workers are on strike, in many cases after being incited to strike by agitators, they receive no pay, and their families suffer privations with which union leaders do not have to contend. When one reads the Press and listens to the news on radio and television, it becomes obvious that it is union leaders who are very much opposed to this legislation providing for court-controlled secret ballots. The Minister emphasised, although Opposition members chose not to listen to him, that what the Bill provides will not take the place of conciliation. Obviously conciliation is the first step to be taken when a dispute arises.

I applaud the Minister for introducing such sensible legislation. It is quite obvious that it will update the industrial laws of this State and make Queensland a leader among the States in this field. The Bill is an attempt to give to the rank-and-file member of a union the right to indicate whether he wishes to remain on strike or return to

work. As a matter of principle, that should surely be applauded by all members of this Committee.

Mr. LAMONT (South Brisbane) (7.27 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I rise this evening to congratulate the Minister on the introduction of this legislation. I remind all members, however, that any legislation that deals with human relations, as industrial relations must be, relies on good will, understanding and a desire to improve productivity and the standard of living of the whole community. Unfortunately, prior to the details of the Bill being given, we have seen from Opposition members, who purport to represent the working class, a lack of good will, a lack of understanding, and a lack of any desire to see a coming together of sections of the community in the spirit set out in the Bill.

There is only one possible way in which to view this Bill. It gives the individual rank-and-file his chance to say whether or not he wishes to withdraw his right to work—in other words, his labour. I believe, with the member who spoke before me and also, I think, the Minister, that a man's labour is his to withdraw if he so desires. But he ought at least to have a say whether that is the action that he wishes to take. He should not be merely a tool or pawn of ambitious union leaders or rabble-rousers further down the line. The Bill is far-sighted enough to ensure that honest, decent working men will have the right to register their say when their right to strike is being exercised.

If we turn to the Minister's introductory speech, we will see that he said that the present section 98 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act must be replaced because it is not working. The honourable member for Rockhampton North, who spoke immediately after the Minister, seemed to agree with him. Like the honourable member for Townsville South who spoke later, I also believe that section 98 does not work, and that it should be replaced. The honourable member for Townsville South said that he thought the section did not work because the Government did not have the guts to make it work.

I do not think that a free-enterprise Government should see its duty as interfering in union affairs when it can provide a remedy under which the responsibility for cleaning up the union house is restored to individual unionists. That is the main principle of the major part of the Bill. It bestows the facility for cleaning up the union house on the unionist himself, and that is what we most applaud in the Bill.

I do not believe, as the honourable member for Townsville South suggested, that it is the Government's responsibility to go out and clean up that house when we have a Minister and his aides astute enough to find this formula whereby the individual unionist working in co-operation with his fellow

workers can in fact take the necessary action. This legislation is truly in the liberal tradition. It minimises Government interference and, like a police officer, it assists in the restoration of law and order and in the prevention of unrest, at the same time using (as all police officers ought to use) the minimum force necessary.

If we have a look at the formula, we see, as the Minister has said, firstly, that the commission "may", of its own motion—that is to say, if an individual unionist comes up and says, "Look, I've got this information for you", or if the commission has reasonable grounds to suspect that there has been foul play—and, secondly, "shall"—it is mandatory—upon the application of not less than 20 per cent of the employees engaged in the place where the strike has occurred—"may" in one case and "shall" in the other—institute ballots. The honourable member for Rockhampton North took issue with secret ballots. I have never understood what it is that certain members of the Left Wing have against secret ballots, but obviously some of them do harbour something against such ballots. The Minister said that he is concerned that there must be no interference, no intimidation and no duress placed upon a unionist who is called upon to determine whether or not he will withdraw his labour from an employer.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North questioned the use of the words, "all employees at a place where a strike has occurred". I think those are the words used by the Minister. This perhaps does need clarification. I understand it to mean that only the strikers in that shop or at that location would in fact be voting as to whether or not a strike should continue. If, for example, there was a strike at a printer's works, say at the works of "The Courier-Mail", and the printers went out on strike, I would not expect that the commission would in fact ask the journalists and the managerial staff to participate in that ballot. As far as I can see, it quite plainly sets out that 20 per cent of those strikers could apply for a ballot to be taken and the ballot would be taken amongst those on strike.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North also talked about the days when a commissioner could declare that a vote be taken throughout an area or within a 10-mile radius of a certain point for the purpose of determining whether or not a strike affecting that area, should continue. I agree that that could be nonsensical. I think the Minister agrees that that could be nonsensical and for that very reason that sort of procedure is not contained in the Bill; that will no longer take place in Queensland while ever this legislation is in force.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North came up then with a very curious argument about blackmail. He said that if a majority of unionists on a secret ballot determined they wanted to go back to work and a minority of them, say, half a dozen or

whatever it might be, decided they did not want to go back to work, then when they come to cast their secret vote they would be under certain pressures. Of course, being a secret ballot, they would not be under the sort of pressures that the fellow who wants to go back to work can be under when the Communist unionist comes up to him and says, "Don't you vote for going back to work, fellow; you do what you're told."

The honourable member said they will be under a moral pressure of their own. They will think, "I've got certain conditions of pensionability; I've got conditions with my employer; I've got a mortgage on my home; I've got other things apart from the principle of why we are actually going on strike." The honourable member says that that is a form of blackmail. If that is blackmail, it is a new interpretation of blackmail as far as I am concerned. That to me is the unionist who, on thinking about going on strike, weighs all other factors—the flow-on, the pensionability, the effect on his long-service leave, and so on. Of course, those are the very things the Left-wing unionist does not want him to consider. That is the type of consideration that smacks of responsible unionism and responsibility to a man's wife and dependents, to his neighbours and those people who are being supplied with the goods that he is being employed to manufacture. That is responsibility, and that is what the Left Wing in this country does not want in unionism.

To get around it, the honourable member says it is blackmail, and that the fellow's conscience would force him to go back to work because of considerations beyond the principle of sticking with his buddies. So he said the unionists would not be voting on the principle on which the strike hinges, but on all sorts of other consequences, and that this would be unfair. If the Bill achieves no more than that the man who goes to the ballot-box to cast his secret vote as to whether or not he goes back to work considers things such as his responsibility to his family and his responsibility to the community, the Minister should be raised to the highest level of knighthood in the land, and not be criticised by those piddling arguments of the Opposition here today.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North talked about the splitting of workers in a given area. He said, "If they go to the ballot-box, we will have some of them voting to go back to work and some of them voting to stay out on strike. You will be splitting the worker from his mates." I do not see how that happens with a secret ballot any more than it happens with any sort of ballot—if it is a fair ballot. That is something I should like to have explained to me—unless, of course, it is not a fair ballot.

Mr. Yewdale: I explained that to you in the lobbies.

Mr. LAMONT: The honourable member shouldn't try to pull that one on me. I did

not ask him that one in the lobbies. It was the previous point that I raised with him there.

Getting back to my point on balloting—it works both ways. Honourable members opposite cry that if the majority want to cut the strike and go back to work, the minority are left high and dry. I have more sympathy for the other result, that is, where the majority decide they do not want to go back to work and there is a minority that want to earn their daily living. I have more sympathy for the minority that want to exercise the right to work than for the majority that want to exercise the right to strike. But I will go along with the principle of majority vote. If there is a secret ballot and the majority vote this way or that way, I will say that that is fair, but the Left Wing says, “No.” It says, “If the majority want to go back to work, what about the poor little minority?” The poor little minority that want to stand on some sort of rat-bag Marxist principle! That is the only principle that the Left is concerned with.

We may wonder whether this 20 per cent provision referred to earlier will in fact prove effective in helping to solve industrial unrest. In some unions it probably will not. There are probably many unions where unionists almost to a man are behind the union leader. That is as it should be, and that is what we would expect, but for the life of me I cannot see what honourable members opposite have against the secret ballot. I look at the front page of today's “Telegraph” and see the headline “Furore on Strike Laws”. That edition came out prior to the time when the Minister announced actual details of what the strike laws would be. Apparently there are some people in the union movement who are against legislating on strikes at all. They do not care a damn what the legislation provides. They do not care what the laws say. If anybody from the Liberal Party or the National Party says anything about strikes, there is a furore according to this newspaper, which came out before noon when the Minister made his first announcement about what the strike laws would be. Under that headline the “Telegraph” reports—

“Secret ballots will not resolve any industrial dispute any faster than present methods,” Mr. Egerton said.”

According to the same article Mr. Warburton followed on with—

“What if one union votes to return to work and another votes to stay on strike?”

What if they do? How does a secret ballot make that any more devastating or any more difficult for the union movement? Why is there so much concern about secret ballots? Surely it is quite possible that in a fair open ballot one union will vote to go back to work and another will vote not to. The attack on the secret ballot legislation is something that completely mystifies me, but my hang-up probably is that I am a liberal and a democrat, and I believe that the majority have

the right to cast their vote according to their conscience and in private. As I said, that is probably my hang-up. I am not a Left-winger; I do not believe in coercion; nor do I believe in any union boss or any other rat-bag somewhere down the line trying to put undue pressure on a decent working man who wants freedom to express his opinion. That is probably why I cannot understand the Left-wingers' concern—in fact, abject horror—at the idea that a unionist will have the right to sit in private and cast his vote according to his conscience without anyone else knowing how he votes.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North challenged us to cite instances of violation of secrecy. He said, “I know there are a few exceptions and I will give two myself.” He managed to forget to do that for us, so I shall cite such an instance for him.

The Printers Union holds a secret ballot. No-one sees how the members of that union vote. When they stand at the ballot-box they are given little envelopes and their ballot papers. They vote “Yes” or “No”, or for some candidate or other, and they put their ballot-paper in the envelope, lick it and seal it down. And then what do they do? They write their name on the outside of the envelope, sign the envelope, and have their name ticked off on a register before they put the envelope in the ballot-box.

One member of the Printers Union who, rather than put his name on the front of the envelope, wrote on it, “This is supposed to be a secret ballot”, and then in rather graphic terms but perhaps not in the tradition of the best of English literature described what the union boss should do with it. His vote was counted as an informal vote. That is one instance of the regular violation of secrecy at the ballot-box. The unionist is required to write his name on the outside of the envelope containing his vote. What a great secret ballot that would be!

The honourable member for Rockhampton North told us that he is a member of sporting clubs, the Scouts Association and what-not, and he added, “All of us stick our hands up to vote for the president and for life members and so forth and if it's good enough for sporting clubs, why not for unions? We are all mates, aren't we?” The difference is, of course, that sporting clubs, the Scouts, the Girl Guides and whatever other organisations the honourable member for Rockhampton North might belong to are voluntary organisations. They are certainly not organisations in which members sign away to the president or the secretary or the committee the right to take away from members their right to earn their livelihood. That is the difference.

I heard the speech of a former Leader of the Opposition the honourable member for Bulimba, and that of the present Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for

Lytton, but unfortunately I missed the speech of the honourable member for Port Curtis. The honourable member for Bulimba attacked the provisions relating to secret ballots for the appointment of union officials. The Minister covered this aspect very well when he said—

“Briefly, the existing provisions enable a union or branch of a union or a proportion of the union membership to request the Industrial Registrar to conduct an election of union officials. However under these provisions the Registrar is required to adopt a passive role . . .”

He went on to explain that this Bill will allow those union members who feel that there has been an irregularity, and who seek redress, to be given that redress. And that's a fine thing, too. The old practice of “Ayes to the right and scabs to the left” at union meetings has to be stopped. We have to give a person the opportunity of voting in privacy according to his conscience. After all, the one to be considered is the individual unionist—not the union boss, not the union executive, not the Carmichaels or the Half-pennys, not employers, not the unionist's mates who might lean on him and not the Communist who shoves his elbow into adjacent ribs and says, “Put your hand up.” It is the unionist himself who is the striker. He is responsible both to his conscience and to his family.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about access to a job site and asked, “Why should the union official have to go along to an employer and announce that he wants access to a job site?” The honourable gentleman was skirting around looking for an issue on which he can win (if he doesn't find one that he can win on soon, someone will replace him as Leader of the Opposition). He implied that the employer could then decide whether or not the union official would be allowed to have access to the job site. That is not envisaged at all in this legislation; it simply formalises the means by which a union official can go in without disrupting the operations at the employer's site and say, “I am an official of the union. Here are my credentials. I am going to talk to the men.” There is no way in the world that this legislation suggests he could be prevented from doing so.

There are several other topics I wanted to discuss, but I will have to leave them until the second-reading stage. I should like to dwell for a moment on sweetheart agreements. It is entirely proper that sweetheart agreements be reviewed by some form of authority, because sweetheart agreements, such as the Woodward agreement in 1972, can be made between very powerful unions and a monopolistic private enterprise for reasons other than the betterment of industrial relations between employer and employee. In some circumstances they are made because the employer knows, quite cynically, that, as a monopoly, he can pass on to the consumer the added cost of the better pensions, better wages and better conditions. When

sweetheart agreements are inflationary, and entered into in a cynical manner rather than in the interests of better industrial relations, they should be subject to some sort of scrutiny.

Under this legislation, as described by the Minister, it is not mandatory that there shall be a hearing on a sweetheart agreement; it merely provides that the registrar may pass on to the commission a suggestion that a hearing should be held. Once again, this is the least interference and the minimum force necessary to ensure that unionists themselves set their own house in order and, more importantly, have the right, the means and the access to set their own house in order. Because of those principles I think the Minister has introduced the first ray of hope in this State that we might see an improvement in the human relationships in the industrial sector. I commend him very highly on the legislation he has introduced.

Mr. MOORE (Windsor) (7.46 p.m.): In speaking to the amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, I point out firstly that my main reason for speaking at this stage is not to go deeply into the Minister's remarks. They have been covered fairly well by earlier speakers and, at the second-reading stage, I intend to deal with them in some detail.

For a number of years I was a shop steward in the Railway Department. I did not want to be elected to that position and I suppose that I would be the only known Liberal in a very long time to be elected as a shop steward in the Railway Department.

Mr. Frawley: It must have been an honest ballot.

Mr. MOORE: It was not a ballot. It was a unanimous decision. I suppose they recognised quality.

I support the vast majority of trade unionists, who are very good, decent, honest and responsible men. There are not many bad apples in the trade union barrel. The average trade unionist is the salt of the earth and this legislation is not designed to harm him in any way.

All that the average trade unionist wants to do is earn sufficient money to support his wife and children in a decent way and let his children enjoy a good education. While the average worker does not want to be very wealthy, he wants to know that he has some security. He wants to give an honest day's work for a decent day's pay. It has been well said that the labourer in the vineyard is worthy of his hire.

The vast majority of unionists favour this legislation. Since the legislation was foreshadowed, seven or eight unionists have telephoned me to ask what the Government intends to do. I have told them that it is not the Government's idea to try to knock trade unionists; that we are only trying to

give them a say in their own affairs. Generally speaking they favour the proposal, and I might say that their wives do so especially. There may in the future be a need for amendment, but there is not much wrong with it at the moment.

Trade unions are very necessary. No-one is suggesting they should be abolished. In days gone by they were far more necessary than they are today. However, if we did not have them, many employers would revert to type. There are good employers and bad, so there is need for a trade union movement to prevent exploitation and unfair practices.

It is also necessary that trade unions be active on working hours and conditions. The trade union movement could well consider a variation of hours. I know that that would cut across overtime payments, by which employees receive time and a half, double time, double time on time and that sort of thing. Especially in the cities, which have a transport problem, it would not be a bad idea to have working hours staggered to a greater extent than at present. With a view to spreading available sporting facilities over a greater number of people, some people could have Saturday and Sunday off and others Sunday and Monday. I do not suggest that people should work on the Sabbath, but it may be that some could work on the Saturday and have the Monday off. That would be of great assistance. It is time the trade union movement started thinking along those lines. It would not break down conditions. I know the trade union movement strove very hard to obtain an 8-hour day. When we had a 44-hour week and an 8-hour day, many workers were prepared to work 8½ hours a day simply to get the Saturday off.

Another justification for trade unions is prevention of victimisation. It does not happen often, but it is not unknown. It is necessary for unions to show a solid front to ensure that their members receive justice.

One of the worst problems encountered in the trade union movement is the demarcation dispute. They occur mainly because the trade unionist is frightened that, if someone else does his job, it will be lost to him. These disputes arise frequently in times of unemployment. The unions say, "Let us have a line of demarcation, with a boilermaker doing a certain type of work and a welder doing another type." It may be a simple job—a job for the welder—but a line of demarcation is drawn simply so that more unionists will be employed. That is very costly to the community. I sometimes think that, of all the things the trade union movement suffers from, demarcation disputes are the hardest to solve. They are the ones in which the trade unionist feels that he is personally involved. His own livelihood is at stake, and so a demarcation dispute occurs.

I repeat that I have some doubts as to the effectiveness of this legislation when it becomes law. It allows for secret ballots to be held for a return to work, but in my view

it could be improved if it proved that a union could opt to have a secret ballot before a dispute occurred. The shortcoming of the present proposal is that there is a week's delay before the ballot takes place. If the vote is for a return to work, the employees are given a week to return to work or be dismissed. As honourable members know, the average strike does not last for a fortnight, anyway. When the trade union movement gets around to working out how to handle this legislation, it will see that it does nothing to prevent a strike lasting a fortnight. If the legislation does not do that, there is something wrong with it. The coal strike did not last a fortnight. I see this as one of the shortcomings of the legislation.

When the trade union movement gets used to the idea of court-controlled secret ballots for a return to work, the movement might decide to put its own house in order and have secret ballots before going on strike. Before union members go on strike they could be given two ballot papers, one for strike action and the other for a return to work. If the majority decided to go on strike, and the Industrial Commission was satisfied that the majority had voted for a strike, a strike would take place, and when a majority were in favour of returning to work, a strike would be called off.

Mr. Hanson: How did you get kicked out of the E.T.U.?

Mr. MOORE: I am glad the honourable asked me. Some honourable members are members of the E.T.U. They have been out of the trade for many years. On the pretext that I had been out of the trade for over three years, the union used a by-law to get rid of me, but the real reason was that this democratic body, the E.T.U., did not want as a member of the union a Tory member of Parliament. That is all it was. My removal had nothing to do with my attending to a lift or anything else. The honourable members for Bulimba and Lytton and others still remain members of the E.T.U. It is the type of union that has one rule for Labor and one for Liberal.

Mr. Lamont: Is it true that some of them are still members of the Property Owners Association?

Mr. MOORE: If the honourable member says so, I will take his word for it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! The honourable member will return to his speech.

Mr. MOORE: With due respect, Mr. Gunn, I was merely answering a dreadful interjection from the honourable member for Port Curtis.

Mr. Frawley: I resigned from the E.T.U.

Mr. MOORE: That is the honourable member's prerogative. I would have liked to remain as a member and look after

other members' interests, as I did for many years and as I am still trying to do by other methods.

The average trade unionist wants to control his own affairs. This Act will give him that right. If union members find themselves on strike, they have the right to call it off. No-one can be blamed for making an honest attempt to introduce something that might work. If the legislation has any shortcomings and the trade union movement feels that it should be amended, it is up to that movement to say to the Minister, the Government or a member of Parliament, "Would you consider amending the legislation this way or that?" Any reasonable Government would consider it. The vast majority of unionists want to appear to be right and responsible as they are.

When they are on strike, no money is going into their homes. These days the average home owner, particularly the newly married couple, has a refrigerator, furniture, a car, a washing machine and many other items on hire-purchase and they have to be paid off. If repayments are not met, the articles are re-possessed. Unionists know this only too well, and for this reason do not like strikes at all.

Strikes do not occur unless trouble has been brewing for some time. It is only a very odd dispute that arises overnight. Strikes usually occur in large departments such as the Department of Railways or in a large motor manufacturing firm employing hundreds of men. The administration feels that it is far and above the rank-and-file employees. This does not happen with the employer of half a dozen men. There is a good rapport between employer and employees in small establishments, and in such situations there are virtually no strikes. The worker in the small business knows the facts of the situation, and there is much better liaison there than there is in a large establishment.

We claim not to have compulsory unionism. There are people who do not want to belong to a union but, contrary to the United Nations Bill of Rights, we are forcing them to belong to an organisation that is anathema to them. If we force people to belong to unions, we should not force them to belong to a specific union. I must confess that I do not know how there could be a union of odds and sods, but if a person does not want to belong to a particular union because, perhaps, he does not like its rules and by-laws, there should be some way, without resorting to conscientious or religious grounds, in which his wishes could be met.

Mr. Jensen: Just make sure he doesn't take any pay rises that the union gets.

Mr. MOORE: It has nothing to do with pay rises. They are paid by the employer. Unions do nothing to pay them.

Mr. Jensen: Rubbish!

Mr. MOORE: The only person who pays wages is the employer.

Mr. Jensen: Unions are going to court all the time to get rises. Don't be stupid.

Mr. MOORE: Another point worth mentioning is that unions often miss out in applications to the Industrial Commission for pay rises because of poor advocacy. Even though a case may have all the merit in the world, it may be lost because it has been poorly presented by the advocate. There must be something wrong with the Act for that to happen. When I was in the trade union movement I often saw that happen when cases were badly presented. I think that the Industrial Commission could well have its own investigating officer. When a union puts forward a claim, he could investigate it to see whether it had any merit.

There are those in the community who say that the workers should work harder. Certainly some of them could, but those who are already doing a full day's work, perhaps on a conveyor belt or in a situation where so many articles have to be made each hour, such as women and girls making clothing, simply cannot work any harder. There are some people who could increase their effort by 10 per cent or 20 per cent without even noticing it, but those working on production lines and in similar situations do not want to be told to work harder. They just cannot do so. Those who say, "Produce more" have in many cases never produced anything in their lives.

I have every sympathy for responsible trade unions, and I appreciate that there are not many that are not in that category. But no-one can convince me that the unions are not themselves very tough task masters and very ruthless towards their own members. If a unionist does not, as a matter of conscience, go on strike, he is subjected to persecutions by his own workmates and the trade union movement. If the Government brought down legislation that so punished and penalised any worker, there would be a hue and cry, but when the trade union movement does it nothing at all is said. Generally speaking, I do not have much sympathy for the hierarchy of the trade union movement; they can look after themselves without any problem at all.

One great advantage of this legislation is that it legalises strikes. The position previously was that if a strike occurred and somebody made an application to the commission, the strike suddenly became an illegal one. How ridiculous that was. If this Bill does nothing else, it makes strikes legal, which is a progressive step. Now that strikes are legal, there should be nothing to prevent the commission hearing a claim while the strike is in progress instead of saying that the strikers have to go back to work before it will arbitrate on the dispute.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AKERS (Pine Rivers) (8.6 p.m.): This Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act as outlined by the Minister is a revolutionary piece of legislation. It may be seen merely as amendments to an existing Act, but when one looks closely at the chief points, one can see that it is indeed revolutionary. Much of the debate today has centred on one or two points. Generally the Opposition spokesmen have said that it is bad legislation. They have selected one or two facets on which to speak and have generally ignored the parts that will receive universal support.

To correct this fault to some extent I will list the provisions outlined by the Minister in his introductory speech. The first point was that the present penal provisions which operate against employees who engage in strikes will be repealed. The Opposition should not bleat about the elimination of penal provisions in the Act. They have been calling for this action for years and, as the honourable member for Kurilpa said, we are removing the illegality of strikes; we are protecting the right of employees to strike. We recognise the right to strike as a necessary tool in the improvement of conditions of workers. The Minister proposes to do what the Opposition wants, but now they say it is bad legislation.

There is a provision for secret ballots as an added tool to assist in resolving work stoppages of long duration. Do the members of the Opposition want strikes to continue even if the members of the union do not want them to continue? Now they will have the power to make the decision themselves, but the members of the Opposition say this is bad legislation. Those who vote in the ballot will be protected from intimidation. Many honourable members have today cited numerous occasions where intimidation has had an undesirable effect on the result of ballots; but again the Opposition has said this is bad legislation. There is a clarification of the method of resignation from a union designed to protect union members.

There is clarification of the rights of a union representative entering onto the private property of an employer and there is a provision giving the registrar power to conduct the election of union officials. If this will ensure that union elections are completely democratic, what more could the Opposition want? The men and women representing the workers of Queensland will be their true representatives. Mr. Miller, is that bad legislation?

Holidays that were lost to employees previously will now be added to their long service leave. In this manner there will be no discrimination between employees on the length of their long service leave—they will all receive the same benefits—but again the gentlemen of the Opposition have said it is bad legislation.

There will be equal pay for performing work of a like nature or of equal value. The principle of equal pay for women has been introduced into the Federal Public Service and the South Australian Public Service as well as all awards under the control of the South Australian Government. Both now have Labor Governments; but the honourable member for Nudgee says that this is bad legislation. He still stands in this Chamber and supports Mr. Whitlam and Mr. Dunstan, yet he believes we should not be introducing this legislation in Queensland. Does the A.L.P. really oppose equal pay for women?

As to the protection of safety representatives similar to the protection afforded to union representatives—what is wrong with protecting the jobs of men who have been elected by the workers to protect their rights? Not once have I heard honourable members opposite call for the removal of the protection of union representatives, but now they do not want legislation to protect the safety officers. I believe that on some of the multi-storey buildings they are even more important than union representatives. Honourable members opposite have stood in this Chamber and referred to the number of times when building jobs were not safe. They have demanded that legislation previously introduced by the Minister include such provisions, but now they do not want those men's jobs protected. They want them to be on the same basis as everybody else—liable to be fired for doing the work they are elected for.

The Bill makes provision for the elimination of the disruptive sweetheart agreements. In his discussion of that principle the honourable member for Nudgee spoke in direct opposition to his Federal leader. Mr. Whitlam has called for the end of sweetheart agreements, as has Mr. Hayden, but we have the wonderful member for Nudgee saying that they should be allowed and that he thought that this was bad legislation.

The Bill also provides for the elimination of conflict between registered unions and those purporting to represent unorganised groups of workers.

There is an extension of time from six months to 12 months for which an employee can recover arrears of wages. The honourable member for Archerfield cited a disgusting case. He referred to an employer who admitted that he had been withholding pay due to an employee. But now that honourable member, too, says this is bad legislation to extend the rights of such an employee.

As the honourable member for Fassifern said, the Minister will have problems in enforcing the provisions; but it is not up to the Minister alone to see that the Bill works. These revolutionary ideas will require the support of all fair-minded men and women in

Queensland. They are being given the opportunity, and it is up to the people of Queensland to take advantage of it. I support the introduction of a Bill as set out by the Minister.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) (8.14 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words in support of the Bill. If one pauses for a while and looks at what has been occurring in our nation over the past few years, one can only welcome such legislation and hope that it will at least improve future industrial relations between employer and employee, particularly in Queensland. Let me acquaint the Committee with what has occurred in the last few years. To illustrate how popular strikes are becoming, I intend to give a few statistics supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Since 1972 there has been an accelerating rise in the number of working days lost in industrial disputes, and similarly a very large amount of wages has been lost. In 1969 238,000 working days were lost in Queensland. The record of the other eastern States is much worse than ours. The following table sets out the number of working days lost each year since 1970 both in Queensland and in Australia as a whole:—

Year	No. of working days lost—Qld.	No. of working days lost—Aust.
1970	179,000	2,393,000
1971	271,000	3,068,000
1972	292,000	2,000,000
1973	320,000	2,634,000
1974	529,000	6,292,000
1975 (till end of May)	1,243,000

As honourable members will see from those figures, there is an urgent need to stop industrial strikes and the consequent personal loss and hardship.

I refer now to the following table showing in round figures the wages lost in Australia for each year since 1969—

Year	Total of Wages lost
	\$
1969	22,985,000
1970	30,883,000
1971	45,241,000
1972	32,074,000
1973	45,206,000
1974	128,000,000

No country can afford losses of that magnitude. It must be plain to everyone that industrial disputes have caused a great deal of personal and national hardship. For example, I have seen North Queensland fruit-growers go to the trouble of packing their produce for sale on the Sydney markets,

only to find that, because of a rail strike or some other industrial dispute, their goods will not reach their destination.

The industrial chaos prevailing in Australia makes me wonder sometimes whether this is in fact a civilised country. I should imagine that in this enlightened age a better method than industrial strikes can be found for solving industrial unrest. The whole situation has got out of control. Big industrial unions are exercising their industrial muscle. They will call a strike almost without any reason at all. They are quite content to throw their own members as well as thousands of other workers out of employment. This occurred in the recent coal strike, during which many industries closed down. It is impossible to estimate the loss suffered by the State through that strike. Opposition members just do not seem to understand that in addition to the employees the person who suffers most is John Citizen. Very often strikes add substantially to costs. When the inflation rate in the past few years is related to the figures I cited, it is perfectly plain that the inflation rate is gradually bringing the purchasing power of our dollar down to its lowest ebb. Some of our old people who retired on what they thought were reasonable superannuation schemes, savings or insurance policies that would free them from financial worries are far worse off than they ever dreamt of. At the other end of the line, young people who are anxious to build a home or start a business are caught up in the same way. It is almost impossible for them to make a go of it.

Our big industrial unions are controlled by self-professed Communists—not people whom we call Communists—who appear periodically on television programmes. They call strikes for any purpose, and the poor rank-and-file member has no alternative; he has to go along with them. As an honourable member said a little while ago, if he does not he is called names which Australians do not like.

I support the Bill whole-heartedly, especially the provision of the right to call a secret ballot to see whether workers want to strike.

An Opposition Member: What happens if they are already on strike?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We know that they are on strike. As I said a moment ago Opposition members should know better than I how strikes start. Today we would have no hope of conducting a ballot. Let us be sensible about it; everything can be going along rosily when suddenly a stop-work meeting is called, which lasts for a minute, and a strike is called. How can a ballot be organised in those circumstances? Do not Opposition members think it is fair that the men who are called upon to forgo their wages should have some say? This is a very sensible approach. In this way they can overrule the people who are

hell-bent on bringing economic chaos to this nation as quickly as possible. I am amazed at the attitude of some Opposition members to this legislation. When they consider the gutless effort in this field of their cohorts in Canberra, who are trying to control this country, they should realise how dissimilar their actions are to those of some of their predecessors who were prepared to do something when a similar situation arose. What has the present Federal Government done? We have heard of nothing.

We have been told about the appeals to the Government in Canberra by some of our Ministers during the last coal strike in Queensland to get it to do something about alleviating the problems. But the Federal Government would do absolutely nothing. The cohorts of Opposition members in Canberra sat on their backsides and hoped the strike would sort itself out as quickly as possible. They were not concerned about John Citizen or the people they are supposed to represent. The attitude of the A.L.P. at the moment seems to be that they could starve or do what they liked. I am very glad that I am not associated with it.

Surely there must be a day of reckoning. Surely at some stage Opposition members have to reconcile their attitude with their consciences. It behoves A.L.P. members to do everything they can to make sure that this legislation—the first of its type in Australia—works successfully. Only in the atmosphere that will be created by this measure will we get back to the basis that some of us knew a few years ago, that is, when there was mateship in unions, with one fellow prepared to help the other. What do we see today? Frequently we see, as my friend mentioned a few minutes ago, a person attempting to do something that somebody else thinks he ought not to be doing. Immediately industry is held up by a demarcation dispute. Surely the country should not be held to ransom over things like that.

I sincerely hope that this legislation will receive the support that it deserves from our friends on the other side and more particularly from the members of the unions, to whom we are looking for support. It is with great pleasure that I give it my wholehearted blessing and commend the Minister for his forethought.

Mr. BERTONI (Mt. Isa) (8.26 p.m.): In speaking to the proposed Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, I notice that the good will of the Government is extended in more than one direction towards the members of the trade union movement. Senator Kathy Martin's proposed marriage to a former A.W.U. organiser seems to be one aspect of compatibility between the Government and the unions. Just as I hope that eventually all the Senator's problems will only be small ones, I hope that this Bill will continue to remove the little problems in our industrial relationships.

Tonight we have heard a lot of debate on the proposed Bill from both sides of the Chamber. However, I would like to reflect on the good relationships that exist between some unions and management. If members of this Committee would just take a look towards the North West they would see some of the best examples of good union-management relationships that exist. In the last few years the North West has come of age. We have learnt many lessons, particularly from the big dispute in 1964—on both management and union sides.

Mr. Marginson: Wasn't a chap named Mackie up there?

Mr. BERTONI: Yes. He is an outside influence about whom I will comment later. Throughout my speech I will inform honourable members that he is an example of the type of person we do not want in our area. We do not need him. We can handle our own affairs.

Mr. Jensen: You sent him sand-mining to get him out of the way.

Mr. BERTONI: We sent him to Fraser Island for the sake of members of the Opposition.

Other unions are jealous of the benefits that Mt. Isa unionists have gained for their members; but they forget the effort it takes to get these benefits and the increasing effort it requires to maintain those benefits and get extra ones. One example of the common-sense attitude that exists in our area is the two-yearly round-table negotiations that take place between management of Mount Isa Mines and representatives of the various trade unions. At those discussions wages, working conditions and grievances generally are thrashed out. Vital matters are resolved at numerous meetings. The mine continues to work and, more importantly, the men are paid and their families benefit.

The benefits that our unionists gain for themselves are the result of common sense, perseverance and forward-looking unionism. Further benefits are gained daily by the men doing a decent day's work for their negotiated awards. The men work as a team and produce results. Everybody gains. I say to the hungry-eyed members of the less-respected unions that one receives only what one works for and what one deserves. It is about time the trouble-making leftist Communist radicals were democratically kicked out of unions. Their aim is far from sensible. They do not believe in a fair day's work, and the benefits to the nation are non-existent.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about the boss?

Mr. BERTONI: The boss is always fair. I think the honourable member would know the example of outside interference that we in the Mt. Isa electorate experienced recently. One thing that happened was that the trade union congress decided that there should be a total ban on the mining of uranium. They

did not even request the union members' opinion. They just informed them. That caused an immediate uproar in our area. We do not believe that we should have outside influences in our area at all. Outside influence in the affairs of local unions is what destroys good unionism.

Mr. Yewdale: Would it be fair to say that the negotiations at Mt. Isa are in the hands of the officials of the Trades Hall unions in Brisbane?

Mr. BERTONI: No. I do not think so. I think they are in the hands of the local unions. The final say belongs to the local union leaders. Do you mean to tell me that the local unions are being dictated to by the Trades Hall?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. BERTONI: I am sorry, Mr. Miller.

I am not against strikes if they are held in a democratic way and the decision is made secretly. I believe that on many occasions strikes are beneficial to the union members. As long as they are held legally and democratically, they are acceptable. We honestly believe that outside influences in local union affairs in our area should not exist.

Mr. Gibbs: Like Pat Mackie?

Mr. BERTONI: Yes. That is a typical example of an outside influence. Look at the problems he caused in our area. I have a report here of a statement made in March 1965, during the dispute, by Mr. Williams who is the A.W.U. State secretary. It reads—

"Mr. Williams said the legislation was necessary to stop 'hoodlums running Mt. Isa either physically or industrially.'

"Mr. Williams last night claimed that a man who had played a prominent part in the picket lines at Mt. Isa had never worked in the mines.

"Mr. Williams said this was the man whose picture had appeared in 'The Courier-Mail' on page one yesterday wearing a shirt with the writing 'Brother don't give up.'

"He said this man had been 'imported from Darwin as an agitator.'

"The man had applied for membership of the A.W.U. . . . but had been refused."

This is the type of outside influence we do not like in our area.

The Opposition should take note of this. It also applies to southern influences and particularly international influences. I think that every good union member should be aware of foreign interests which are un-Australian. Do not let sadistic influences which play on humanity's greed and selfishness worm their way into union life. In case anybody thinks

these influences do not exist, I repeat that they do. Every honourable member should be fighting against them.

I hope that this Bill will pioneer further days of good industrial relationship in Queensland. Under this Government, Queensland has one of the best records in Australia and it should stay that way. The only people who get hurt by strikes and industrial playing around are the families of our State. I pray for the day when strikes will not be needed and everything will be in harmony.

I certainly do not want to be one to blow the trumpets on the miners of the North West. But that is an area I know a lot about and an area that has much to give to the rest of Australia and is working for the benefit of good industry and good family living. It began soon after Mount Isa Mines Limited opened. We imported into Australia quite a number of Finns to work in the main ore body. These gentlemen worked underground under adverse conditions. Today we are pleased to say that we have 47 different nationalities working in harmony in that area.

It is an area of which everybody is envious, particularly regarding the harmonious attitude of the people themselves. These people deserve the benefits they get from their awards because they have braved the disabilities of the area and have made a contribution with their many skills, share an industrial area and work for the benefit of Australia.

Our local memorial garden settlement is a monument to the generosity and efforts of members of the A.W.U., the Trades and Labor Council and the mine management. The efforts of unionists have made this settlement one of the finest civic projects in the North West and, believe it or not, it will not remain as it is. At the moment on the drawing board is a \$500,000 project for a Mt. Isa recreation community centre for which Mount Isa Mines Limited have donated \$100,000, and we sincerely hope that next week the unions will vote on contributing to the project. This is a typical example of what comes from a good relationship between unions and management.

Mr. Gibbs: They have a good member for Mt. Isa, too.

Mr. BERTONI: Yes, there is a good member for that area. Mr. Bob Katter, for Kennedy, has been there for a long time. He represents the whole of that area. It is also good to see that they have seen the light and returned a National Party member for Mt. Isa itself.

I think it only fitting that tribute be paid to some of the fine union men of the area, such as Mr. Alec Pavusa, Mr. Joe Doherty from the Trades and Labor Council and Mr. Dave Harris from the Australian Workers' Union, who have been tireless in their efforts to promote what we regard as the best kind

of unionism. I regard the efforts of unionists in the North West so highly that I have made recommendations for honours to be awarded to some of them.

I sincerely hope that the Bill will eventually produce the result for which it was designed. If it does, men who have served worthily the cause of unionism will certainly continue to support it.

Mr. TENNI (Barron River) (8.37 p.m.): I should like to compliment the Minister on the introduction of this legislation. I must say that he has guts to bring down a Bill of this nature. We are all aware of the union troubles in this country and throughout the world today. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I appreciate that it is not the worker who is to blame but the Communist-controlled unions. It is not the worker who causes strikes; he does not want them. The ones who cause them are the leaders who, whilst forcing their own members out of their jobs, continue to draw high salaries. If they are so fair dinkum, why do they continue to draw their salaries while their members are on strike? Why do they not give that money to the unfortunate people who are forced out of work through the Communist dictatorship of union leaders?

Mr. Jensen: They don't want to be simple.

Mr. TENNI: If they wanted to be simple, they would join the A.L.P. If one speaks to the ordinary rank-and-file unionist, one will find that he does not want strikes. What he wants are secret ballots, and the proposed Bill contains such a provision. Those to whom I have spoken say that unionists are frightened that if they do not put up their hands to vote in favour of a strike, they will be called scabs. Let us face it; that is what happens today. So they put up their hands; their pockets become empty and their children starve for want of food. That is the type of thing that is going on in this country today.

Not long ago there was a strike in the coal industry. It would be interesting to take a survey and ascertain how many cars of miners were repossessed because when they were on strike they could not afford to meet their hire-purchase payments. That is an indication of what is happening as a result of unnecessary strikes. I heard the honourable member for Mulgrave quote facts and figures on the cost of strikes to the country. The figures were quite alarming. No wonder we are suffering from such terrific inflation today. If we are not careful, we will end up like England, which is in one hell of a mess at present, caused once again by Communist-controlled unions.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. TENNI: We are very close. Thank you very much, Tom. But thank goodness we have a strong Government and strong Ministers who are prepared to do something about these Communist-controlled unions.

One point I would like to make is that I believe the honourable member for Bulimba, I think it is—

Mr. Glasson: Fourrex.

Mr. TENNI: Yes. He made some remarks about me in my absence. I do not have the full text of what he said, but from what I found out it is not unusual for such remarks to be made. Because they are completely untrue, one takes them with a grain of salt.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. TENNI: If the honourable member was not in the Chamber, if, like the Leader of the Opposition, he was playing billiards or whatever it is out the back, that is his fault; he should have been here listening. I happened to be receiving a deputation at the time. I was attending to my duties as the member for Barron River, not drinking beer or playing billiards out the back. So it is up to the honourable member; he should come into the Chamber unless he has to attend a meeting or receive a deputation.

Mr. Aikens: And they all walked out of the Committee when the Right-winger the honourable member for Port Curtis was speaking.

Mr. TENNI: That's right. I think the honourable member for Port Curtis said that the provisions of the Bill were detrimental to the working class. I do not know how he arrived at that stupid conclusion. To me anything that will assist the average unionist cannot be detrimental to him. The average worker is interested in working for the money he receives, not going out on strike, thereby creating unemployment and boosting inflation.

Let us look at what is happening to private and public enterprise, and, as far as that goes, the State and Federal Governments. We have reached a stage where the average rate of pay is incredibly high. We do not have any more \$1 increases; now they are all increases of \$9, \$20 or \$25. They're enough to put a lot of companies out of business. The thing that really concerns me is that we now see these little flow-ons like the 17½ per cent holiday pay loading. In other words, we are saying that an employee is worth more when he is on holidays than when he is working. That is ridiculous. We have to pay for long service leave and all other sorts of cost increases. A counter-jumper on a basic wage of perhaps \$109 ends up with \$170 or \$180 a week with all these extras added on. This is what is breaking public and private enterprise. It certainly influenced Mr. Hayden to allow for an inflation trend of 25.2 per cent in the Federal Budget and we will certainly need to do the same in our State Budget.

But the thing that worries me is that in this country today we have Communist-controlled unions which are putting their own men out of work. The employee who pays

his yearly subscription to the union which is supposed to be there to look after him finds himself out of a job because of it. To me this is a very serious state of affairs and one that cannot be allowed to continue. We have to get the message across to these unionists that their leaders are there to look after them, the boys who rely on their weekly payroll to take home to mum and the children instead of having those leaders deliberately creating unemployment.

I could name dozens of companies in my electorate alone that have gone out of business. The staff of my own companies has been reduced by 50 per cent in the last nine months so that the firms could stay in existence. I did not want to put those people off, but because of the demands of the unions I had no option. If I had not done it all of them would have been out of a job by now. Something has got to be done to stop that type of deliberate loss of employment to the average man in the street who has mum and his kids to look after. It is about time those at the top of Communist-controlled unions woke up to themselves and did what they were put there for.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Will you take an interjection?

Mr. TENNI: No, I will not. I am very concerned about the state of this country, thanks to the honourable member's Communist mates. We have enough problems with the Federal Government—one couldn't call it that; the socialist regime in Canberra—and the effect it has on this country, without having Communist-controlled unions with 182 known Communists at the top of them. We can't have both and expect the country to stay on top. We will go down faster than England went down unless we all get up and fight. That means the man in the street, the man who boils the billy on the council job, the man who works behind the counter and everyone else. We all have to fight to stop the stupidity of strike action and the deliberate loss of jobs.

We have seen the control exercised over councils by unions. Consider the cost involved in setting up camps in shires such as mine with a huge area of 20,000 sq. miles to cater for. In such large areas a lot of camping has to be done. In the old days my dad camped under a fly. He was quite happy to do it to get a bob to feed his kids. But today the council has to provide an aluminium caravan with a lean-to out the front. Huts cannot have dirt floors; they must have either concrete or wooden floors. Beds cannot be only 6 ft. long; they must be 6 ft. 3 ins. Gas refrigerators and gas stoves have to be provided. It is unreal. Councils need extra vehicles to get the caravans and all the equipment to the camp sites. The unions have brought this about. It is good for the men, but the same men are paying rates. They are being

burdened by the unions' demands. It is so stupid the way things have happened over the last few years.

Do not let it be said that the A.L.P. is governing this country; the A.L.P. is not governing anything. It couldn't govern the toilet down the back yard. It is the unions that are governing this country, not the A.L.P. Of course, we are all aware that the A.L.P. is there for only a short period of time—thank goodness! Let us hope that when the Liberal-National Party goes back into power, it will consider nation-wide arbitration similar to what our good Minister is proposing here today. Perhaps then we will get somewhere. If our friends on the Opposition benches oppose this legislation, they will be joining their Communist friends in control of unions. I am sure that all other honourable members will support the Bill to the fullest.

One honourable member said that Gough Whitlam and Mr. Hayden want to wipe out all sweetheart arrangements. Certainly we have Gough Whitlam and Mr. Hayden doing it, and probably even Jim Cairns, because we have not heard anything about Junie Morosi lately.

I support the Bill to the fullest. I am sure it will be passed. I know we will have some eventual problems with it because of the agitators in the A.L.P. Left Wing. Thank goodness there are not many of them left. A Labor Party member who lives on the South Coast is reported in today's newspaper as saying, "I have been in the A.L.P. for 20 years and now I have seen the light." In my electorate I have 79 former members of the A.L.P. who have seen the light and asked me to sign them up as members of my party. The members on the Opposition benches are, however, still in the dark. They cannot be blamed, I suppose, because they know if they buck they will suffer the fate of Senator Field; they will be thrown out of their party.

I hope that the Opposition members will use some common sense in this matter and will realise that the Communist-controlled unions are costing the average worker his job. When that happens, it is his wife and children who suffer most. I have seen enough of that type of suffering in my electorate to know how important it is to keep the workers in employment, and, by jove, it is impossible to get financial aid from the Federal Government to give security to those who suffer most.

Mr. Aikens: Why don't you disguise yourself as Flo Kennedy or Germaine Greer and you'll get all the money you want?

Mr. TENNI: That's a very good idea. Perhaps the honourable member for Townsville South has seen the Bill.

Mr. Wright: You look alike.

Mr. TENNI: I would hate to say what the honourable member for Rockhampton looks like. No mirror could stand his face.

Finally, I repeat my plea to the Labor Party members to wake up to themselves and look after the man in the street, who, until now, has been kicked in the pants by them.

Dr. LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (8.51 p.m.): I rise to add a few well-chosen words to this debate.

Mr. Jensen: Now we'll hear about the A.M.A.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: At the end; I have not seen the Bill.

Mr. Houston: Haven't you?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: No. I am not one of the select few.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Aren't you on the Minister's committee?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: Not yet.

The right to strike is the accepted right of all workers in this, a free, country. What the Committee is debating is where the public thinks the right to strike correctly belongs. Certainly strikers should not be treated in the way in which Josef Stalin treated them when he destroyed nearly 6,000,000 Ukrainian farmers to remove any suspicion of a suggestion of a trace of revolt among the peasantry. We have come a long way from the days when sackings on the eve of 50 years' service and the loss of the right to a pension were the order of the day; when regular pay increments were not the order of the day; when a man was dismissed for asking for a justly earned rise; and when employees were sent to Coventry for bringing to attention of members of Parliament and other leaders the plight of some of their workers. Many of us in this Chamber have forbears who suffered during those times.

Sackings were rife at the turn of the century, during the depression of the 1930's and even in the late 1940's. Workers who were kept constantly in debt and forced to remain in work to earn the money they needed were not eager to participate in strikes. The society in which we live today has, likewise, by the proliferation of hire-purchase agreements, mortgages, high rentals and the like, made it necessary for workers to continue working or, alternatively, to suffer serious financial embarrassment and possible disruption to their life-style.

Many strikes occur as a result of the poor application of psychology by both employer and employee.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: Politicians have tended to polarise sections of the population by dragging them into groups of "us" and "them", "we" and "they", and "Right" and "Left". Over the past two years this nation has missed a great opportunity to become

a united "we". Those in authority have failed to guide Australia effectively through the oil crisis and the international monetary crisis. They have allowed inflation to become rampant and affected seriously the workers of Australia.

The individual unionist must belong to a union, and that union must be effective. The ordinary unionist cannot successfully enter into debate with an advocate who is a trained orator and skilled in arbitration, so he must have recourse to a union that will represent him effectively. All too often in my medical practice I have had to pick up the ends of tragic medical circumstances arising from an accident at work. The man concerned has not been covered by workers' compensation and perhaps not even been paid the correct rate, and both his union representative and his employer have failed to secure for him his legal entitlements.

Without adequate communication between employer and employee there will be a rift in understanding and the creation of mistrust, and this will lead to tension, aggression and hostility. It is quite easy to play on these, and a man with only five minutes training can stir up a mob. As Chairman Mao said, all the leaders in selected industries should at least be familiar with all the jobs in those industries, and perhaps should return regularly to labour in them to maintain a sense of proportion. Worker participation and ownership can increase their understanding of an industry and improve its efficiency. Worker participation in management has long been held as a means of aiding worker-management understanding and producing much smoother industrial relations.

In recent years this country has seen many strikes of different types. There have been financial strikes such as those affecting cement and steel. Chronic shortages quickly led to price increases, and shortages and increased prices resulted in greatly reduced employment opportunities in the building industry. The construction of commercial and public buildings and also private dwellings was affected. Many strikes have been union-induced. Unionists have downed tools at the least provocation. They have shower-rooms and lunch-rooms that they do not want, but perhaps they do not have the things that they really need.

In this country, many strikes have passed unrecognised for what they were. There is no doubt in my mind that some of the longer strikes have been kept going by employer groups and the unionists concerned have not had the insight to realise that they were merely the scapegoats. The recent ban on the export of wheat to Chile was a strike of convenience, if ever there was one. The wharries in New South Wales refused to load the wheat; but there is no way in the world that the Transport Workers' Union in New South Wales did not know that its members were hauling that same wheat from Sydney to Pinkenba, where the Brisbane wharries

loaded it. The net result was an increase in the price of wheat to Chile, which was then completely out of favour with the Australian Government.

During its 22 years in Opposition in the Federal Parliament, the A.L.P. used strikes to highlight political issues when it found that its voice in the Parliament was ineffective. Everyone is familiar with Mr. Hawke's modus operandi of setting up a strike, letting it go on for three or four days, then flying in to mediate, heal the wounds and claim a victory.

Mr. Hanson: Garbage!

Dr. LOCKWOOD: As the honourable member for Port Curtis said, it was garbage. The Press saw that, the public saw it, and Bob Hawke ceased doing it.

The recent miners' strike highlighted the many problems arising from differences between State and Federal awards, and these differences should be settled once and for all.

It also highlighted the threat of loss of employment when mines are flooded and closed. The miners have a genuine concern for the continued functioning of the Ipswich mines and for their livelihood. In this I support them completely. There is a need to keep the mines in the Ipswich area going. Perhaps more should be opened. The great powerhouse at Swanbank must not be allowed to become a white elephant. The Government must foster the mines in Ipswich to keep it operating for its full life.

Mr. Marginson: I am with you all the way.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: I thought the honourable member would be. I have worked hard as a resident medical officer at the Ipswich General Hospital when the honourable member for Wolston was the hospital secretary. He knows, as I do, that the miners work hard. They have a very dangerous job. They do not shirk their work; they get stuck into it. They have a tremendous accident rate. They are well and truly worthy of their reward.

Mr. Houston: Why do you criticise them so much?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: I have never criticised them. The honourable member has not listened to a word I have said.

Strikes are becoming as ineffective as a well-known four-letter swear word. No longer does the public take any notice; in general, it has become apathetic to strikes. If a strike is to be effective, it must be a sensation. Fuel strikes take up to two weeks to be effective. The power restrictions that resulted from strike action by miners were not absolute and were not at all effective. A great many people took no notice of them; many others complied with them and thought that the cool shower in the morning was something of a joke and perhaps an invitation to lead a more Spartan way of life; most welcomed the reduction in their electricity bills.

In the days when Australia's primary industries were its major export earners strikes affected only a small section of the economy; but today's strikes affect the vast majority. Honourable members opposite may learn something from this. A strike must be just, fully effective and have public support; the strikers must win in the negotiations and they must go back to work.

Demarcation has been mentioned by other speakers. It is a very important contention that rights of demarcation have to be supported by the various workers. There has been a strike that has received little publicity but has been very successful. It was, of all places, behind the Iron Curtain, in the Adriatic States. Demarcation was the issue. The Government health centres were stealing all Government superannuation medicals from the local G.P.'s. The doctors used their collective brains, as one has to do in a collective State. Public opinion was sought. It was found that public opinion supported them. They called a swift strike, which was total. With the public on side, the matter went to negotiation. The doctors won their point in the negotiations and regained their right and went back to work. Not one of them was shot.

Today strikes have become something of a plaything. They are not the hard battle that they were at the turn of the century, at the time of the great shearers' strikes and the great wool strikes. They have become something of a political football. They have lost their importance. Any measure that brings strikes back into the proper perspective—that is, the inalienable right of a worker to go on strike without fear of recrimination for going on strike and then to have the issue settled once and for all—is well and truly worthy of the commendation of this Assembly.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (9.4 p.m.): Today could be described as a golden opportunity for Government members to become involved in an exercise of belting the trade unions. It was started early this morning by the member for Toowong and it was kept going for most of the day, including tonight, except for the last speaker, the member for Toowoomba North, who endeavoured at least to present to the Chamber a researched approach to the subject. I agree with some of the comments he made.

Let us examine the contributions of some of the speakers. The member for Barron River made a desperate effort to get back on side with his electorate. We recall the speeches he has made in the Chamber in which he attacked the Aborigines, attacked the teachers and attacked the railway workers. He has attacked the unionists generally. Now he is kicking the Commie can, which I suppose is the last-ditch stand for anyone who really wants to do over his electorate and get on side with the arch conservatives in his electorate.

Mr. Casey: Would you say that, like the Mareeba tobacco, he has gone up in smoke?

Mr. WRIGHT: I would say so. I do not think he will be back after the next election.

A Government Member: You wouldn't know.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would put money on that one.

The honourable member for South Brisbane gave us his usual academic diatribe. He has told a number of Government members that he is the most impressive speaker in this Chamber and anybody who has a conversation with him will be told how many books he has written. I am told he is now writing another one, entitled "What's in a Name?" I will be very interested to read that one.

The honourable member for Mulgrave spent a tremendous amount of time relating the statistics on the number of days that have been lost through strikes. I note that he and other speakers have never bothered to set down in this Chamber the hours and days lost through injuries in industry. Considering the S.G.I.O. complaints I get in my office—and I know honourable members will agree with me—there are hundreds upon hundreds, week after week, totalling many tens of thousands of dollars. But we do not hear Government members complaining about those, nor do we read in the Press reports of the men who have been injured in industry and who have suffered financially and physically. But the media always report on strikes that have taken place. We do not have the media coming to trade-unionists and saying, "Tell us about the injuries that have occurred to unionists." They are not interested in that. They are interested only in kicking the striker. This has always been the case. There seems to be a propaganda move by this Government and the media generally to do over the unionists and more so the union leaders. We tend to have them portrayed as big ogres. This can be seen in cartoons.

Mr. Byrne interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: The honourable member should not start talking after his speech today. He even had Government members half asleep and the jokes they told about him outside the Chamber—well I can understand that and I had better not proceed with it.

As I say, the general propaganda move in this Chamber and throughout this community is to present union leaders as ogres. This is done time and time again. It can be noticed in the cartoons on them. Nothing is ever written up about the times unionists vote against the union leaders' recommendations or about the times the unionists decide not to go on strike. It is only when a strike takes place that there is publicity.

I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Toowoomba North say that the right to strike is in fact a right. It seems that is well accepted except when a trade union is involved. It is O.K. for the grazier not to sell his cattle. It is O.K. for him to go to a sale and, if the bid is not high enough, refuse to sell. It is O.K. for a retailer to put out a product and take nothing less than what he puts forward as his suggested price. It is what he asks for and what he says he has a right to expect.

A unionist has only his labour to sell. In the view of most Government members—in fact I would say almost 99 per cent of them—the unionist has no right to withdraw his labour. They forget that his only ware is in fact his labour. We should ensure that he always has the right to withdraw his labour if he is not satisfied with the price being offered for it.

Mr. Byrne: That is what the Bill does. You obviously have not read it.

Mr. WRIGHT: I know that the Bill has not been printed. It would amaze me—in fact I would be totally disgusted—if the Minister has broken the ethics of this Parliament and presented a Bill to Government members before the passing of the motion for its printing. I hope that he will deny any such suggestion. There are certain rules in Parliament. I am amazed to hear the honourable member for Belmont say that he has seen the Bill and I ask for an explanation of this later.

Mr. BYRNE: I rise to a point of order. My interjection was that the honourable member did not listen to the Minister, not that he did not read the Bill.

Mr. WRIGHT: Oh, Mr. Kaus, I would call the honourable member a liar.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Kaus): Order!

Mr. WRIGHT: I will say that he deals lightly with the truth.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: It is unparliamentary and I think the honourable member should apologise.

Mr. WRIGHT: I withdrew it, Mr. Kaus.

Some months ago I was of the opinion that we should have some type of secret ballot until I was advised that the union already has a right to have a secret ballot. In fact secret ballots have been held. In the recent power crisis, for example, a secret ballot was held, and it will be remembered that the union members voted in that secret ballot to stay on strike. So it is a lot of baloney to talk about secret ballots.

Mr. Lamont: Why are you so scared of them?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will tell the honourable member why I am interested in this matter: it is because it is all part of an over-all campaign to do over the unions.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, it is. This Government has always worked on fear and smear. It is an old Nazi tactic, and it has been used time and time again by the anti-socialist parties. You find an enemy. Hitler found the Jews, and the Government has found the unions. The Government attacks the unions and makes them the bogey. The honourable member for South Brisbane is well known for his attitude, even amongst his own Queensland Teachers' Union counterparts. Most Government members fall into this category. Their attitude is, "Let's find someone to fight against. Let's find a common enemy."

If honourable members think back, they will see that that is the way the Premier has worked against the Federal Government. He, too, has used this tactic. He has found a common enemy, and he has fought against him. We know the type of tactics used. It is claimed that the Federal Government is anti-moral, anti-traditional, anti-socialist and anti-democratic. I was extremely surprised when I saw recently on television some people asked what they had against the Federal Government. About eight of 10 said, "The loss of freedom."

Mr. Byrne: Hear, hear!

Mr. WRIGHT: But when those people were asked what freedoms they had lost, they could not answer. I challenge the honourable member for Belmont to tell us what freedoms he has lost. Like many other people in the community, he has been indoctrinated and conditioned.

Mr. BYRNE: I rise to a point of order. I find the remarks of the honourable member offensive, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Kaus): Order! What are the remarks to which the honourable member refers?

Mr. BYRNE: The honourable member said that I had been indoctrinated.

Mr. WRIGHT: If the honourable member takes exception to that remark, I will withdraw it. I feel very sorry for him. If that upsets him, I cannot understand why he tips cans the way he does. One thing to be learnt in this Chamber is that if you give it, you have to be able to take it.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Committee to allow the honourable member to continue with his speech.

Mr. Moore: He's getting very abrasive.

Mr. WRIGHT: Not to you, Mr. Kaus.

I say that the people have been conditioned against unions and union leaders. Whilst it is unwarranted, it is something that is very real. If any member asks people in the community generally what they think of the Trades Hall, he will receive some strange comments in reply. I have heard people speak about the Trades and Labor Council as if it were something sinister. I have heard young people in my area tell me of the things that they have heard that go on at the Trades and Labor Council. As the honourable member for Rockhampton North will confirm, I have had occasion to take some young people to the Trades and Labor Council. Most people who have any knowledge of the matter know that anyone can go there as a visitor and listen to proceedings. Those young people were simply amazed at what took place there. That is the only way to combat the indoctrination of honourable members opposite.

The number of speakers from the Government side reveals another part of the fear campaign against unions. It is vital that they be able to associate themselves at election time with the anti-union approach. I am not sure whether it is done with an eye to endorsement or whether it is some part of their philosophy; but they have to have an enemy, and the honourable members for South Brisbane and Windsor, and all National Party members, are involved in this way. They have been constantly kicking the can, and they will continue to do so.

Mr. LAMONT: I rise to a point of order. I find the remarks of the honourable member offensive. I said very plainly in my speech that I believe in unionism but the right of the individual unionist is the first and most important principle of the Bill.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept the honourable member's explanation. The honourable member for Rockhampton North will have something to say about that gentleman later. We ought to be very careful about what we believe the honourable member for South Brisbane says.

The Government is anti-union, and will continue to be anti-union. I feel that it will be seen that this legislation is anti-union. Other members have spoken on this matter, and some trade-unionists have come out publicly today pointing this out. It is a pity that we do not remember what the unions have done for society. It is a pity that we cannot go back, as the honourable member for Belmont at least tried to do, and see the important contributions that have been made to society by trade unions in wages, conditions and the general quality of life. We tend to forget that it was not so very long ago that children were working in coal mines. It was not so long ago that we had all sorts of exploitation of migrants and—

Mr. Lamont: When did you last swing a pick? You're a chalkie.

Mr. WRIGHT: Unfortunately I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth like the honourable member for South Brisbane. I had to work my way through, as he well knows. I went to school with that honourable gentleman. We could tell a few tales about that. But I have done my bit as he well knows. I have worked in country areas and done all sorts of jobs to get ahead so I understand a little bit about it. I know very well the honourable member has never worked in his life. We know the graft and corruption he has been accused of; not that I would say he did it, but we know he has been accused of it.

We know this whole legislation is just another step in creating division and conflict within the community. These are the tactics that have been used before and will continue to be used. The Government not only finds an enemy but it has to create diversions. It has to create division and conflict. If it does not do this it has no case because the philosophy of the parties opposite—well, they have no philosophy. I spoke to a meeting at the Clayfield College for girls the other day. A representative of the National Party was asked to go along and present the philosophy of that party. He was asked to speak for 20 minutes—only 20 minutes—but Mr. Mike Evans could not do it. Instead he attacked the Federal Government—

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: Oh, ask the people who were there. Ask Mrs. McCobe, who was as disgusted as I was. Ask the people who applauded me when I attacked him for what he did. He had no philosophy to present, and this is the whole trouble. The Government parties have no philosophy; they have a vacuum. They can only remedy this lack of a philosophy by creating this conflict and this fear—

Mr. Lamont: I remember your wife applauding. Who was the other person that did so? There were two who applauded your statement, weren't there?

Mr. WRIGHT: I think we will leave him alone, Mr. Kaus.

Mr. Lamont interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: Look, I will have to go on with it, just for a quick diversion. I remember the days when we were at college. The honourable member for South Brisbane used to stand at the end of the swimming pool flexing his muscles and walking around and because of the way he walked around we used to call him "Flut-flut". I will not go into that, but that was one of the nicknames he had. The one I mentioned the other night was "Feathers".

But time is getting on and I want to make my comments on this Bill very clear. I do not believe recognition has been given to the union movement. I believe this whole Bill is a further attempt at union-bashing. I believe it is simply designed to create conflict,

fear and division within the community and I believe that time will prove that what I am saying is true.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (9.18 p.m.), in reply: I really thought the honourable member for Rockhampton was so wound up that I had a few more minutes to clear my thoughts.

At the outset I want to say that the remarkable aspect of this legislation is that a free-enterprise Government has recognised the right of employees to strike and, having recognised this cherished right of the trade union movement, we now put into the hands of the rank-and-file unionists when a strike occurs the right to determine whether or not they want to continue the strike. This hallmark in industrial legislation introduces a new dimension and I am sure that the community will recognise that it is a genuine attempt to come to grips with a most grievous problem which, in the past few years, has had such a serious effect on the economy of the State and the nation.

Mr. Hanson: Ken Morris said that 15 years ago.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The honourable member prattles away pretending to speak for the trade union movement, and yet in his own business he would be ranked with the leading capitalists of the State.

I want to make a broad comment before dealing with the various contributions that have been made and refer to a Press report of a remark by the Leader of the Opposition in the past few days. He suggested that the Government was running out of legislation, yet when the most important legislation in the last decade and a half concerning matters in which Opposition members should be vitally interested comes before the Assembly, only seven members—

Mr. Wright: Seven out of 11.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Seven members of the Opposition—

Mr. Wright: Not a bad average.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Seven members out of 82 members—

Mr. Wright: Seven out of 11!

Mr. CAMPBELL: Seven out of 82 members of this Assembly have chosen to speak in opposition to the legislation. That indicates just what proportion of the Assembly purports to speak for the work-force. When one analyses the contributions made by those seven who purport to speak for the work-force, and who consider they have a mandate from the trade union movement, one sees the paucity of the argument that the A.L.P. Opposition can offer to one of the most important pieces of legislation affecting the work-force that has come before Parliament.

I appreciate the responsible response of the spokesman for the Opposition, the honourable member for Rockhampton North, in his contribution.

Mr. Marginson: Be careful, Les; it may be the kiss of death.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I don't have to be careful in whatever I say. At the outset the honourable member dealt with past history. That was a matter for him. We are not living in the past but in the present and looking forward to the future. He quarrelled with the fact that the Government had not acted under section 92. It was not for the Government to act. One of the reasons we are amending the Act is that under the existing requirement of the Act somebody has to prompt the commission to act. The highlight and hallmark of this measure is that we entrench with the commission the right to exercise its own judgment when an industrial situation occurs. That is something quite unique in legislation. I am sure that rank-and-file trade unionists will not overlook what we are proposing.

The honourable member asked if it was intended to conduct a zone ballot. When he reads the Bill he will see that the previous concept of zoning no longer exists. He asked who would be entitled to participate in the ballot. That again is a hallmark of the legislation. When a ballot is held the matter is already in the hands of the commission, and the Government gives to the commission tremendous discretion in that respect. The honourable member asked about the extent of newspaper coverage, and suggested that perhaps a newspaper advertisement would not acquaint all those who were involved in the strike with the determination. I think the honourable member was being either naive or infantile, because I would imagine that anyone involved in a strike and knowing the sanctions imposed by this legislation would make it his business to learn from any newspaper what the determination was.

The honourable member queried the legislative provisions that cope with any intimidation of a rank-and-file decision. I have answered that by referring to the fact that at Dinmore Meatworks great courage was required of employees to walk through the picket lines to their jobs. He raised the matter of loss of entitlement of employees who were not acquainted with the decision. I think I could refer to my previous comments on newspaper coverage to answer his question on that aspect.

The honourable member also referred to the right of entry of a union representative and asked what would happen if an employer requested a union representative to come to his premises. I answer that by simply saying there would be no problem. He also questioned the conduct of ballots. I reiterate what I said earlier, that is, that now a ballot cannot be held until someone asks that it

be held, and again the hallmark of the proposed legislation is that nobody will have to ask the Commission to order a ballot to be conducted; the Commission will act on the facts presented to it.

Generally speaking I do not think the honourable member had any real quarrel with the proposals put forward. He and other members did, however, raise the matter of sweetheart agreements. I thought his remarks were completely astray from the attitude adopted over the past three months by his Federal colleagues. I am in pretty close contact with the Federal Minister for Labor (Senator McClelland) and am well acquainted with the comments of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission on the matter of indexation. As I understand it, the Commonwealth commission frowns upon sweetheart agreements, and it appears to me from reading the newspapers that the attitude of the Federal Minister for Labor, and indeed of the whole of the Federal Labor Party, is in line with that adopted by the Commonwealth commission. They, too, frown on sweetheart agreements because of the leap-frogging that has occurred in the past. The provisions in relation to industrial agreements have been introduced as a result of discussions held at conferences of Ministers for Labor, particularly the conference held last week in Hobart, which was attended by all State Ministers and the Federal Minister for Labor. At that conference, all State Governments showed their clear determination to legislate to limit sweetheart agreements, so that such legislation would be in keeping with the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission's concept of indexation. I do thank the honourable member for Rockhampton North for the responsible manner in which he, as the Opposition spokesman on this very important industrial legislation, addressed himself to it.

The honourable member for Toowoong made two very telling points. He said that the Bill represents a moment of truth and that it has brought us and the community face to face with the issues of our time. How well the honourable member for Toowoong posed the problems confronting the community of Australia. We are brought face to face with the issues of our time.

On Friday, when I was privileged to open the fire station at Woodridge, I elicited from the figures provided to me on that occasion, that, in two short years, the cost of running the fire services of this State had doubled. This is one aspect of the moment of truth to which the honourable member for Toowoong referred. He said that he hoped this legislation was a first step. I assure the Committee that this is unique legislation. Never before in this country (or in any other country) has it been tried. We are charting a new course; we are breaking new ground. Only time will tell how effective this legislation will be, but it is an honest attempt to grapple with the problems confronting us. I shall be quite happy for it to run the gamut of experience. If any shortcomings are

revealed as the result of this experience I am sure I will have the support of honourable members in bringing forward amendments to rectify them. I make that comment fully confident that much of what is contained in this legislation has the support of the whole Chamber.

The honourable member for Toowong referred also to the excessive concentration of power in militant unions in the United Kingdom which, to use his words, had produced in Europe the term "English sickness". He hoped that we would not be affected similarly. I am sure that all honourable members will support the honourable member for Toowong in hoping that the terribly debilitating situation which has become apparent in the United Kingdom as a result of the excessive concentration of power in militant unions does not arise here.

The honourable member for Callide highlighted, with very telling effect, the impotence of the Whitlam Government in failing to implement its pre-election promises of 1972 to introduce measures to counter militant subversion. The Prime Minister gave a very pitiful presentation—I shall refer to this later on—in attempting to bully the unions concerning their aspirations or, perhaps, their wishes not to see wage indexation introduced. As I understand it, he has little support from the trade union movement in Australia. That is his problem. I can only say as a fairly experienced observer of industrial matters that I question his tactics. I am sure that the Prime Minister will greatly regret the fact that he tried to hector the trade unions into submission. How little he understands the mechanism of the trade union movement. On the other hand—and indeed I say this with great humility—I think I have a much greater appreciation of the operations of the trade union movement in this State.

I would like to comment on the contribution by the honourable member for Ithaca. He chided the Opposition members for their apparent lack of interest in the measure. In the light of what has happened since his address, I am sure that he really hit the nail on the head. Although members of the Opposition may not have been completely uninterested, I do not think they know which way to turn. One would expect that their attitude to legislation such as this would indicate a greater interest and awareness than that of Government members. My mind goes back to my early days in Parliament in 1961—I referred to it in my opening remarks—when the Honourable Ken Morris re-wrote the industrial laws of this State.

Mr. Melloy: "Kick where you see a head."

Mr. CAMPBELL: He did not say that during the debate. He said it at a Liberal Party convention. I was there. I know. It was five years before Mt. Isa. That is how little the honourable member for Nudgee knows.

As I started to say, as a relatively new member of Parliament I had a feeling of inferiority because there were about 34 members of the Opposition, most of whom had a great deal of experience in trade-union matters. Consequently, they were able to trade punches with the Government on that occasion. I compare the vigorous debate and the vigorous opposition that I as a relative newcomer to the Chamber saw to the Government's proposal with the almost infantile opposition that has been advanced to this legislation.

I believe the honourable member for Ithaca reflected the attitude of his constituents when he said, "I don't believe the great bulk of the work-force should go on strike because of the actions of a few dissidents." I believe that most members would echo that point of view.

I pay particular attention to what the honourable member for Bulimba said. I am sorry he is not here now. He said bluntly and blatantly—it was not an inference on my part—that I had no enthusiasm for the legislation. However, he then spoilt his argument by bringing in puerile arguments about this, that and the other. I say to the Committee—and I stress it to members of the Opposition—that, as well as having personal faith in the proposals being presented here, in all modesty one of the two initiatives in the legislation reflects my own personal views.

From the collective contribution of Opposition members today, it seems to me that my acquaintance with the trade union movement as a Liberal exceeds theirs—and they, I would hope, are still active members of the trade union movement. I have held membership of the trade union movement. Many years ago I was a member of the Federated Clerks' Union.

The honourable member for Bulimba asked how the strike ballot is to be conducted. Under this legislation the Government is giving the initiative to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, which has the complete support of the Government.

The honourable member asked: if following seven days after the majority of the workers had done with the strike and wanted to return to work, what would happen to the sick leave, holiday leave and long service leave of a man who had not returned to work? The very tenor of this legislation puts the responsibility onto the individual. If an individual wants to disregard the democratic will of the majority of the people on strike and wants to opt out of his employment, it stands to reason that he opts out of any entitlements that he may have. I am sure that the community will not find any principle on which to disagree with that innovation. This comes to the crux of the legislation. In much of the legislation that this country has devised, there have been sanctions such as monetary sanctions and even gaol sanctions. What happened to

Clarrie O'Shea was perhaps the most grievous episode in Australia's history. That unfit trade union official was sent to gaol. I am not criticising those people who sent him to gaol but in retrospect it was a forlorn sort of action which imposed a stricture or censure because the legislation was not observed.

The hallmark of this legislation is that we have not only accorded the trade union movement the right to strike but we have also absolved the trade union officials of any sanctions that might result from the decisions of the members of their unions. The hallmark of this legislation is that we put the responsibility on the individual because, as Liberals and free-enterprise people, we believe that the decisions of individuals are most important in the community. That is our general philosophy. We are applying this philosophy to this legislation and I am sure that the community will applaud us for our action.

All I can say about the contribution of the honourable member for Townsville South is that as usual he spoke with tongue in cheek and I will not spend the time of the Committee in replying to his speech.

I was very impressed with the contribution of the honourable member for Kurilpa, not because he is a member on this side of the Chamber but because of the lucid way in which he expressed himself on behalf of those he represents. First of all he pointed out very clearly that this legislation repeals the existing illegality of strikes. That is one aspect that I thought Opposition members would have acknowledged. This legislation turns its back on the previous legislation. We do not apologise for this. As a matter of fact we are quite proud to turn our backs on previous legislation when we find it to be ineffective. It was left to the honourable member for Kurilpa to be the first to acknowledge this. One would have thought that this would have been done by members of the Opposition who made such a to-do in past years about the prohibition on the right to strike or the requirements of the previous legislation, which fell into disrepute, that a ballot should be held before a strike occurred. One would have thought that they might have been gracious enough to acknowledge that this free-enterprise Government is entrenching in the legislation the right to strike. That is not being questioned. But if the commission, after consultation and after hearing argument, wants to ascertain the opinion of the work-force after a strike has occurred, we are empowering it to direct that a ballot be taken. Formerly, the commission had to be asked to make such a direction.

Opposition members do not seem to appreciate the significance of this legislation. We are helping rather than hindering the work-force. I see that no Opposition member is listening to my explanation of this vital alteration to the industrial law of Queensland. We are not proscribing strikes, we will have no say in whether they do or

not occur, but if a strike occurs and as usual the commission calls the parties into conference and the commission wishes to have recourse to the opinion of those affected by the strike as a means of helping it in its determination, it will be empowered to conduct a ballot and to see that it is held free of restraint.

I am amazed that Opposition members, who purport to support the principle of law and order in the community, should see fit to challenge legislation that provides that a ballot be taken at the work place of those who are on strike and that it be conducted free of restraint. It surprises me that Opposition members should question legislation which, in the event of intimidation or obstruction, which in my book are anti-social acts, gives those charged with the responsibility of conducting the ballot power to ask the police to see that those involved in the strike at the work place can register their votes without hindrance.

There is no question of stopping workers from striking, but if the Industrial Commission, as a completely independent body, feels that a ballot should be conducted, it can make such an order, and those charged with the responsibility of conducting the ballot can have recourse to the police if there is any interference with those casting their votes. Opposition members seem to see something sinister in that provision. That is typical of their shallow and shabby-minded approach to an attempt to resolve a very serious problem in the community. I am quite appalled that a normal requirement of any legislation is alleged by them to be sinister and anti-worker. I am speaking emphatically, and perhaps a little emotionally, but if I have resented today anything, it has been that aspect, especially after affording the people in the work-force the opportunity to exercise their democratic right and protection from those things which you, Mr. Miller, and I and all members of the Opposition know have occurred in the past when ballots not controlled by the commission have been attempted and there has been intimidation and restriction of the opportunity to vote. I hope, Mr. Miller, that you do not think I have been unduly emotional about this.

I want to refer now to the comments made by the honourable member for Nudgee because, for some reason unknown to me, and no doubt unknown to other members of the Committee, he referred to this Bill as jackboot legislation. Heavens above, how could any reasonable person examining this legislation regard it as jackboot legislation? He said he found it completely intolerable. We are giving the work-force the democratic right to exercise their vote after a strike has occurred and the honourable member for Nudgee regards it as jackboot legislation! I see the implication in that term and I say it is not worthy of the honourable member. I am surprised that he should call it jackboot legislation and say that he

finds it intolerable. He said we should have managed the existing legislation better. Holy mackerel! Well, blow me down, we should have managed better! His Federal colleagues have been in office for the past two and a half years. It has been a long, long time. Heavens above, it seems almost like a decade. What have the honourable member's Federal colleagues done about industrial disputation? Heavens above, during that time we have had our worst ever experience of strikes and industrial disputation—of unions thumbing their nose at legislation. I say to the honourable member—he is a friend of mine—that I think, with all charity, his Federal colleagues have given a pitiable display in contrast with our performance in Queensland in the matter of industrial relations.

He said the work-force are not prepared to have the actions of the Government thrust down their throats. What rot; what utter rot! We are not thrusting anything down the throats of the work-force. We are giving to the impartial Industrial Commission the right to determine, in the light of circumstances, how it will approach a particular industrial situation and I am sure this legislation will be applauded by all Governments in Australia. The honourable member does not realise that we are giving the commission complete and unfettered jurisdiction. I could talk about a lot of other things that he said.

I am indebted to the honourable member for Fassifern. He made a very pertinent comment when he said we had to make up our minds whether we have concern for the people in the work-force or whether we simply hand over control to those who are out to destroy our democratic handling of industrial disputes. The honourable member for Archerfield is not here—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I'm over here.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I see he has joined the Government. I am glad he is in the Chamber because I want to say that his opening remarks were so idiotic that I could not pay any attention to any further comments he made.

I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is not here. He referred to the Bill as union-bashing legislation. He did not have the privilege I accorded to the A.L.P. spokesman on labour relations until after he spoke. If the Bill is union-bashing, I ask what the Prime Minister was doing on Sunday night when he indulged in tremendous union-bashing. I do not know whether the honourable member for Archerfield is on the Left or Right, or whether he sits on the fence. I am sure that the Leftists in the trade union movement would not appreciate the Prime Minister's bashing or lecturing, or whatever attitude he thought he was taking. It is quite obvious that the Prime Minister does not understand the attitude of the average worker.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Will I get you a glass of water? Your voice is going.

Mr. CAMPBELL: My voice is not going. It is a pity that the honourable member for Archerfield completely lost his voice in his contribution today.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the Bill challenged the right of unionists to stand up for their rights. He further stated that the Government was out to repress the rights of workers. Who was questioning this? I repeat what I said earlier. The Bill gives the workers through ballots a right which so far has not been availed of because formerly a party had to ask the commission to act. This legislation gives the commission the initiative, after having been acquainted with all the facts, to have recourse to the opinion of the work-force. The honourable gentleman raised a lot of other matters. As a matter of fact he put up dolls to knock down. The Bill is a valid attempt to come to grips with issues of the day and to give the rank and file the democratic right to vote on issues concerning them. There is nothing oppressive about that. Had the Leader of the Opposition understood the legislation, I do not think he would have said a lot of the other things he did.

The honourable member for Port Curtis in his opening remarks put himself in the same category as the honourable member for Archerfield. I should treat his remarks with complete disdain. He referred with pride to the affiliation of his party with the trade union movement. The tragedy of the Australian society is that the trade union movement is affiliated with a political party—the alternative Government. Because of that the A.L.P. is completely beholden to the trade union movement and those who dominate it—the Halfpennys, the Carmichaels and the Mundeys.

Mr. Hanson: Rubbish!

Mr. CAMPBELL: The honourable member can say that it is rubbish, but what is going to happen in the next few days in Melbourne? The honourable member can say it is rubbish but he cannot deny that his party is beholden to the Leftists in the trade union movement. It is beholden to the Halfpennys, the Carmichaels and the Mundeys, who, over the last decade, have been to the forefront in their assaults on the community. Who could deny that? They have wreaked severe hardship on the great majority of Australians in the name of industrial democracy. What a pitiful figure the honourable member presents in apologising for the real masters of the trade union movement.

The honourable member for Townsville expressed the opinion that 40 per cent of the trade union movement was in the hands of the Communists. I cannot confirm that. He also referred to industrial strife in his area, which is quite a realistic situation. I see the honourable member for Port Curtis laughing. He has had his share of industrial strife in his area. The honourable member

for Townsville quoted reported forecasts of union unrest and industrial disputes that will occur in a fortnight's time.

I should like to comment on the contribution of the honourable member for Isis, who, firstly, cited his qualifications to speak as a unionist. A feature of the composition of this present Government is that no longer can Opposition members claim a monopoly in trade union membership. Taking into account the diminished numbers of the Opposition, I am sure that the Government has more than sufficient members who can trade punches industrially with the Opposition.

Mr. Jensen: Maybe the D.L.P. unions.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The honourable member for Bundaberg is casting aspersions on D.L.P. unionism and other unions. It is unworthy of him.

I was impressed by the contribution of the honourable member for South Brisbane, who said that the legislation depends for its successful implementation on the good will of the participants and on the opportunity given to the rank and file to withdraw their labour. That is quite a valid statement. It is a right that the rank and file should have.

The honourable member for Windsor, too, spoke as a union representative. As he said, he is the only union shop steward in his party. He should be applauded by this Parliament. He spoke for the vast majority of trade union members, and is well qualified to do so. He made a most significant comment when he said he believed that the average trade-unionist simply wanted to be able to take care of his family and to lead the life of an ordinary citizen. That is quite a homily.

I regret to say that the honourable member for Rockhampton made no real contribution to the import and merits of the legislation. He talked about ethics and expressed the belief that I had made the Bill available to certain people. I assure him that it was not made available to anybody, but my speech notes were supplied to the honourable member for Rockhampton North, to the Leader of the Opposition and to members of my committee. I do not think there is anything unethical about that. I just wonder what the honourable member for Rockhampton was trying to achieve by making those comments. He made the point that there was already secret-ballot legislation and that therefore there was no need to make any alteration to it.

If he had read the legislation he would have realised that there is the significant difference to which I referred earlier. Under the legislation that we are amending somebody has to ask the commission to conduct a ballot. In my view the most significant difference between the legislation and what is prescribed in the Bill is that the commission is authorised to use its own discretion. I am sure that this provision will make a tremendous difference in the activities of the commission. The honourable member

for Rockhampton said that people have been conditioned against unions. If through the action of somebody the people have been conditioned against the legitimate interests of unions, the unions have only themselves to blame. The trade union movement has displayed shocking shortcomings in its public relations.

I have a fairly strong acquaintance with the top executives in the Queensland Trade Union Movement.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You broke an excellent record by introducing this Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is the opinion of the honourable member for Archerfield. I am sure that he will regret that puerile observation.

I have an excellent rapport with the top executives of the trade union movement in Queensland. I have a clear understanding of their obligations and responsibilities. Because of my acquaintance with the trade union movement, I know that the majority of its executives are hard-working members of the community, dedicated to act in the interests of their members. On that basis I have complete confidence that this legislation will in no way impair the present freedom of action of trade union executives. In no way will it impair the right of trade unionists or trade union executives to take any action they deem to be in their interests.

The ballot provisions in the legislation are the only ones on which there has been a minor quarrel with members of the Opposition. Indeed, they have been generous enough to acknowledge the beneficial aspects conferred by the legislation. I emphasise that nothing in the legislation will affect the bona fide operations of trade unions and those who have the responsibility of guiding their destiny. But it does provide that, a strike having occurred and the parties having been brought into consultation, the Industrial Commission is empowered to have recourse—if it feels it needs to—to the opinion of rank-and-file trade unionists and employees, who may avail themselves of the provisions and the protections provided in the legislation.

I noted Opposition members' suggestions that the very fact that action could be taken by people who were or were not in the trade union movement would lead to industrial disputation. That could occur only if somebody was a nark and tried to agitate to prevent the true result being achieved by those involved in a strike. If that occurs, I feel quite sure that the public of Queensland, noting what is taking place, will not find favour in such disruptive tactics. I commend the measure to the Committee.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Campbell, read a first time.

The House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.